

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1881.

The Week.

THE Refunding Bill overshadowed all other topics in public discussion during the week and all other influences which affect the speculative markets. The banks, acting under the threat of Congress that the bonds which they had deposited at Washington should not be restored to them, after the enactment of the bill, on the conditions which have accompanied their deposit since June 20, 1874, hastened to gain possession of them before the bill became a law; and this was not checked until late in the week, when the opinion gained ground that the bill would fall through. The only way for the banks to obtain their bonds, which are deposited to secure notes which they have issued, is to put into the Treasury enough lawful money to redeem the notes as they come in. There is then no need of the security which the bonds give. Deposits of lawful money for this purpose were made during the week to the extent of about \$17,000,000, and by far the larger part of these deposits were made at the Sub-Treasury here by New York banks acting as agents for banks in other parts of the country. This withdrawal of lawful money from bank reserves naturally caused a severe contraction of loans and an advance in the rate for money. On Thursday as high as $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent. per annum was paid by the stock brokers for money; on Friday the rate advanced to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per day in addition to 6 per cent. per annum, which is equivalent to 475 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, calling the business year 313 days. This is the highest rate since the great panic of 1873. On Saturday the rate fell to $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. per day, and has since declined to such "reasonable commissions" as $\frac{1}{8}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$. This stringency naturally produced a panic at the Stock Exchange, and prices of stocks fell 1 to 21 per cent. There began to be fears that the panic would extend beyond Wall Street, as the cause of it was the weakened condition of the banks, in which all business men have an interest. Secretary Sherman, early in the week, had given notice that he would pay off \$25,000,000 of 5 and 6 per cent. bonds in May, and would prepay these bonds with interest to date of presentation provided holders would send them to Washington, but this had neither moral nor practical effect. The Secretary then announced that he would buy \$10,000,000 of uncalled 5 and 6 per cent. bonds, paying par and interest for them, and that he would also take the \$25,000,000 called bonds at the same price at New York instead of at Washington. The moral effect of this was to allay the panic, and on Saturday prices of stocks rebounded from 2 to 15 per cent. The practical result, however, was not so great, as only about \$6,000,000 of the entire \$35,000,000 of the bonds sought have been offered, so that the bank reserves of the country are reduced about \$10,000,000 as the net result for one week of the raid on the national banks; and this \$10,000,000 is the basis for \$40,000,000 of bank loans. The wise men in Congress seem to have been as much bewildered at the consequences of their experiment as a child would be who had unwittingly started a locomotive and found himself spinning along the road at the rate of a mile a minute.

The affair brings into strong prominence one of the undoubted defects of what is called the presidential form of government as it exists in this country. Either in France, or England, or Italy, or any other parliamentary country such a bill as the Funding Bill with the Carlisle amendment would be introduced by a responsible minister, and after the events of last week either he or the whole cabinet to which he belonged would have to resign. He would not venture to face Parliament or the country after so tremendous a blunder. With us no punishment for an offence which caused enormous losses, and threatened the whole business of the country with derangement, is visited on anybody. The error is confessed by the bill being dropped, but the authors and promoters of it in Congress simply smile and turn their attention to something else. Mr. Carlisle, for instance, ought to suffer in some way for inability to calculate the effects of his own proposal, but he escapes scot-free, and probably says it would have worked well enough if the

bankers had not been such bad men. It is difficult to see how we are to secure greater care in legislation without attaching some direct and swift penalty to recklessness and ignorance.

We are surprised to find a journal which has seen and suffered so much as the *World* talking such sad stuff as this, apropos of the attitude of the banks towards the Funding Bill:

"It certainly was and is the business of Congress to decide what rate of interest a Government bond shall pay. It is the taxpayers of the country who have to take care of the Government debts. The national banks are not to be the sole and sovereign arbiters of the character and the rate of interest of the new bonds. If they are, Congress may as well abdicate to the banks immediately, and by way of convenience turn the entire charge of the national finances over to the First National Bank of this city, for example, or to any other representative of the banks. That would be indeed a government by banking corporations after the fashion of the Irish Land League in Ireland, and Mr. Fahnestock, for example, might become the Mr. Parnell of the new power."

This is worthy of Governor Plasted or Justus Schwab. Of course it is "the business of the Government to decide what rate of interest a Government bond will pay." But it is the business of the owner of capital to decide whether he will do any banking—and if so, how much—on the terms prescribed by the law. We doubt much whether Schwab himself would compare a man to a Land-Leaguer because he did not choose to engage in the emission of notes—a purely commercial enterprise—under the Carlisle amendment. Our advice to our esteemed contemporary is to retire to his closet and think deeply until he clears his brain of the notion that the national banks are Government officers charged with the duty of issuing bills on any conditions that Congress may impose. He will see, after a while, that no free man would enter into any such engagement, either on his own behalf or that of anybody else for whom he was trustee. A man is no more bound to be a banker under the Bank Act than to run steamers under the Navigation Laws. This is a free country, and the people have far more hard common-sense than the silly writing about the "rebellion" of the banks might lead strangers to suppose.

We think the Boston *Advertiser*, as the chief organ of the Boston attack on Secretary Schurz, owes some explanation to its readers and the public of the extraordinary letter to the Commission on the Ponca case which is appended to the Message which the President has just sent in on the subject. The Commission was appointed late in December to perform the strictly judicial function of ascertaining "the facts with regard to their [the Poncas'] recent removal and present condition, so far as is necessary to determine the question, what justice and humanity require should be done by the Government of the United States." One member of this Commission was Mr. Walter Allen, of Newton, Mass., who is, we believe, and then was, the Washington correspondent of the *Advertiser*, the organ of the Philanthropists; a fact which ought to have made him and the *Advertiser* doubly careful in their doings. Before this Commission a committee appointed at the indignation meeting held in Boston appeared as champions of the Indians, and as prosecutors of Mr. Schurz. They were, therefore, strictly precluded by all rules of propriety from seeking to influence the Commission by any but public statements and proofs. This was the more imperative because the editor of the *Advertiser*, Mr. Goddard, was a member of the Committee, and one of his employees, Mr. Allen, was, as we have said, a member of the Commission. Nevertheless the Committee wrote to the Commission on the 18th of January, before the latter had made their report, the amazing letter which now lies before us. In it they warn the Commission that "great public interest exists in regard to their mission, and that weighty results hang on their verdict," and that "the success or failure of the efforts made in behalf of the Indian races greatly depends on the nature of their report." After this solemn preface they go to business, and admonish the Commission that "acquiescence in the arrangement proposed by the Secretary of the Interior without a full account of the means used to bring it about, will be supposed to have vindicated the cruel policy" of the last four years towards the tribe; that they (the Committee) "claim to have proved

beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Secretary of the Interior has been guilty of a wilful violation of the law in the removal of the Poncas; that he was duly warned by responsible parties of the outrage to be consummated upon this peaceful tribe, and that he alone is responsible for the miseries that have followed the act, and for the disgrace it has brought on the Government. For this he should be condemned."

The rest of the letter is equally impertinent and scandalous, and it winds up with a request that the Commission will report that, "while United States troops were employed to force these Indians from their reserve, these troops were furnished at the request of the Interior Department, and that neither the Army nor Army officers were in any way responsible for this crime or for the miseries which followed." In fact, the whole epistle points strongly to the conclusion that the Committee were much less concerned about the fate of the Poncas than about having Mr. Schurz brought in guilty of *something*. The naiveté with which they reveal their real animus gives the document a somewhat comic air. But it is by no means comic. If it had been addressed to any ordinary judicial tribunal, or to a jury who had retired to consider their verdict, the judge, if he had done his duty, would have sent the whole Committee to jail for a gross contempt. That they richly deserve some such punishment in the present case is a plain deduction from the fact that their ulterior object in committing their offence was to blacken the character of a public officer, and hold him up to the country as guilty of infamous acts.

Judge Sedgwick's decision, enjoining the Western Union Telegraph Company from dividing some \$15,000,000 of its stock under the consolidation agreement with the American Union and Atlantic and Pacific Companies, presents some delicate questions of law. He admits that under the law of this State there is no objection to an increase of stock if the increase is to provide means for extending the business of the corporation, but insists the new shares must be disposed of, so that actual value in some form shall be returned to the stockholders to correspond with the increase in nominal value. "The statute does not mean that the increase is consummated by the consent of the shareholders and the votes of the directors that it shall be made, but it extends to the actual returns to be made to the company upon its disposing of shares." The proposed stock dividend is supposed to represent past income of the corporation not divided among the stockholders but expended in the construction of new lines, the erection of poles and wires, patents, etc. But these investments of surplus income began as far back as 1866, and in all probability much of the original value of the property has disappeared through wear and tear. The remainder of the \$15,000,000 represents stock in other telegraph companies and real estate. As to neither part have the directors of the company taken any steps to ascertain the actual present value, so that it is impossible for a court to say what it is worth. Now, each shareholder's part of a dividend is his individually. He has full control of it, and cannot be compelled to reinvest it in the corporation's capital. "He may, under a general provision adopted by the directors of the company, invest his dividend in the capital, but care must be taken that the sum which he pays thus for new shares shall actually equal in value what the officers are bound to obtain for the stock." No such care had been taken, and consequently the plaintiff, who was a stockholder, was held entitled to a permanent injunction.

The mystery which has long surrounded Jay Gould has at length in a measure been dispelled by the enterprise of the *Herald*. He has allowed himself to be interviewed by a representative of that paper, and an authoritative statement of his opinions on many subjects appeared in the *Herald* of last Monday. As to corporations, Mr. Gould points out that a corporation is—"a body of men who unite, associate, concentrate their capital, ability, and intelligence in the undertaking of a work, great or small, which any one of them individually would be unwilling to undertake. If there are losses, they agree to bear each his proportion. If there are profits, they agree to divide them"—a definition which closely resembles those given by Kent and other legal writers. Corporations, he then pointed out, have developed this country; and corporate property was never so widely scattered in this country as it is to-day. The truth about Union Pacific, for instance, is, that he bought it "when

it was down so low that it could hardly find a purchaser"; when it was "built up" he sold out, the people came in and bought as he sold, so that to-day its stockholders are numbered by the thousand instead of by the hundred. He thinks that the tendency of corporations is more and more toward putting "the people" into control of them, and insists that in striking at corporations you aim a direct blow at popular rights. His "theory in investments" is "to go into everything that promises a profit," but this we could have guessed before. What was never suspected, however, was the fact that in all his financial transactions he is "a mere passenger," and never controls prices in Wall Street, or dreams of controlling prices in Wall Street. With regard to the telegraph consolidation, he says that he consolidated because he found he "could not compete," but he gives no account of the means employed to secure that harmony of views on this subject among the competing companies which was so necessary to bring about consolidation. This is probably because he does not know, for here too his position, he says, is that of "a simple passenger—one of thousands and thousands of men." He believes in developing Mexico, says there is nothing in the Lesseps canal scheme; thinks the Canadian Pacific a visionary enterprise which may pay dividends in a hundred years; predicts a great future for New York as the money centre of the world; argues that elevators and a line of steamers do not make a city, but that "great libraries, picture-galleries, theatres, parks, newspapers," are all needed; and declares that the only danger to the country is the fondness of Congresses and State legislatures for interfering with corporate enterprise.

The death of Senator Carpenter, of Wisconsin, on Thursday of last week, took from the Republicans all hope of controlling the organization of the Senate after March 4. But it cannot be said that the permanent interests of the party will suffer by his removal. He first entered the Senate in 1869, and failed of re-election at the end of his term, in 1875, in consequence of the dissatisfaction of a portion of his constituents with his defence of the *Crédit Mobilier* and the Salary Grab. The next year he was the leading counsel in General Belknap's defence on his impeachment trial. In 1878 he got up a show of a popular demand for his return to the Senate, accepted it as in duty bound, and was re-elected in February, 1879. During his entire service he was a member of the Judiciary Committee, and it can be said of him that, if he was not a great lawyer, his legal abilities were eminently respectable, and would have ensured him both greater fame and greater usefulness had they been directed and sustained by a high moral character. His political career had its occasional bursts of independence, as in his opposition to the Potter railroad law, over which his State lost its head; and still more signally in his attitude towards the double Louisiana government of 1872, when, in New Orleans and in his seat in the Senate, he cogently denounced the action of Judge Durell which established Kellogg in power, and strove to have a new election ordered by Congress. In a speech delivered in March, 1874, on account of which Senator Morton accused him of being an enemy of President Grant, Mr. Carpenter predicted that Louisiana would be a heavy load in the next canvass, and that her vote might settle the contest. In other respects, however, and at other times he was indistinguishable from the rest of the "Senatorial Group." In January, 1872, he attacked the civil-service regulations as impracticable and unconstitutional; in 1874 he was an active inflationist, and by his vote of March 30 was instrumental in postponing resumption three years; during the same year he opposed the bill by which the corrupt moiety system was abolished; and in 1880 he relied, as he said, on an overruling Providence to secure Grant's nomination at Chicago for a third term in the interest of virtue.

Mr. Conkling has the rare satisfaction of having contributed materially to the public enlightenment on the subject of an impartially recruited civil service. His resolution calling for information as to the working of the system in the New York Custom-house was answered on Monday last by Collector Merritt in a candid report showing the whole number of appointments and promotions in eleven months of last year, and embracing an account by Mr. Burt, the Naval Officer, of the examinations conducted under the latter's auspices. To meet the invidious intent of Mr. Conkling's call, the Collector enumerates the

extra employees engaged for what was expected to be a temporary increase of business at this port, and who were consequently exempted from examination, though, as it proved, their services were needed for a much longer time. Comparing the cost of collecting the customs revenue under his own and General Arthur's administration, Mr. Merritt alleges that, ordinary and extraordinary together, it is now .516 per cent. against .7758 under his predecessor. Mr. Burt reports that, contrary to popular prejudice, or what is feigned to be such, out of 731 competitors for the higher grade, only 69 had had a collegiate and 191 an academic education; some 310 had been educated in the common schools, and the rest were self-taught or untaught. The requirements which relate to temperament and general capacity, independent of training, affect the result in such a way that the most highly educated are by no means secure against being distanced. Another discovery is that the age of competitors is rather mature than the reverse, the average age being thirty, and the men between thirty and forty-five having the highest average standing. The provision that appointments shall be probationary for six months is found to be invaluable in testing the accuracy of the examinations and in repairing errors of selection; but in practice only four appointees have been dropped. Promotions are also made by examinations, and forty-five out of sixty-nine successful competitors entered the service under the existing rules. Removals have been for causes approved by the Secretary, and have been mostly in the lower grade. In short, Mr. Conkling has furnished President Garfield with an irresistible argument for at once extending the New York system to all the custom-houses in the country.

The trial of Cash for killing Shannon in a duel, in South Carolina, has ended in a disagreement of the jury. But, as four stood for conviction, this result is looked on by the opponents of duelling as a decided victory for their cause. Hitherto acquittal has, we believe, always followed trial in such cases. This case was, however, one of peculiar atrocity, so that the victory is not so great after all. Shannon was a lawyer sixty years old, the father of fourteen children. In the trial of a cause in which a fraudulent assignment to Cash's sister had been alleged, Cash took offence at counsel's observations about her, but subsequently accepted an explanation and expressed himself satisfied. Afterwards he changed his mind, and flooded the State with printed handbills denouncing Shannon in the most outrageous terms, until the old man was maddened into challenging him, which was what Cash wanted, he being a notorious bully, duellist, and ruffian. There was a crowd on the ground when the meeting occurred, before whom Cash bragged of his pluck and coolness, and his son urged him to "kill the gray-headed scoundrel," and he (Cash) swore he "would kill him as sure as there was a world." Shannon fired with a trembling hand into the ground, and then Cash took deliberate aim and shot him through the heart, and received the congratulations of his hopeful son on his morning's work. Cash's offence was not covered by the recent Anti-duelling Act which makes killing a person in a duel wilful murder, but on the trial the defence acknowledged that in consequence of this legislation Cash was probably the last South Carolina duellist. We hope so.

Things have gone from bad to worse with the British in the Transvaal. Sir George Colley, who was in command, apparently from the beginning entertained a very low opinion of the Boers as fighting men, and flattered himself that he could get the credit of putting them down without waiting for reinforcements from England. He accordingly twice attacked them in strong positions, in which they outnumbered him four or five to one, and met with severe repulses. These attempts might have been excused through ignorance or over-impatience. For the third and last, in which he has lost his life, there appears to have been no excuse, as heavy reinforcements under Sir Evelyn Wood were coming up rapidly. Without waiting for these, however, he tried a stroke of strategy on the Boers by occupying during the night a precipitous height which overlooked their position, with a small force—not over six hundred men, it is said—and without artillery. At daybreak he was able to pelt the Boers with a plunging fire in their own camp, and they were apparently taken by surprise and at first suffered heavily. But they met the crisis in a way which, more than anything which has yet occurred, brought out the really fine qualities of the race. Not only did they not give

ground, but they closed round the British position, and hour after hour poured on it an upward fire, which told with great effect, and in the afternoon stormed it gallantly, killing and wounding all its defenders except, it is said, about one hundred, and driving the survivors down the reverse. It is difficult, in view of these exploits, to account for the low estimate of the military qualities of the Boers which the English officers, who have seen them during the Zulu and Basuto wars, seem to have formed. Sir Garnet Wolseley spoke of them and to them with a touch of insolence when he was in the Transvaal, which he certainly would avoid now, and which, in his case, must have been an expression of military contempt. Mr. Archibald Forbes, too, who had good opportunities of judging of them, thought they could be dispersed by a charge of cavalry. There can be little doubt that the "Elizabethan policy" of the Beaconsfield Ministry diffused through the whole service all over the world a certain aggressive disdain of all races of men who seemed to stand in the way of its execution. Mr. Gladstone, unhappily for him, is reaping some of its bitter fruits.

Nothing, however, can well be sadder than the Boer victory. The loss of men of such quality as they seem to be, in a colony which has to make head against a great sea of barbarism, is almost irreparable, and yet a large British army will now be employed, probably for months, in slaughtering them and laying waste their settlements. Thirteen thousand men are already on the way to the scene of action under Sir Evelyn Wood, and more are on the way out, and Sir Frederick Roberts is, it is said, to take the chief command. The humiliation of this last defeat is too great for the public in England, and the press is clamoring for vigorous retrieval of the honor of the flag, and there will be scant mercy for the Dutch farmers, though doubtless the respect for them is vastly increased. The fact that the three most prominent generals in the British army at this moment, on whom the nation most relies or has been relying for imposing its will on foreign populations all over the world, Sir George Colley, who has just been killed, Sir Frederick Roberts, and Sir Garnet Wolseley, are Irishmen throws some dismal light on Irish aspirations after political independence. The talent of the country in nearly every field is steadily drafted into English service, and shares in English pride, and the poor peasants, who cherish real hatred of English rule, have to express it through "the ragged regiment" who compose the Obstructionist band in the House of Commons.

The Coercion Bill has passed the House of Commons, but it has taken so much time that "urgency" will probably have to be demanded for the Mutiny Act, which expires at the end of this month, and for the Arms Bill, which has just been introduced, and to which, as to everything else, the Parnellites are prepared to offer a vigorous resistance. The Land Bill will, it is said, be forthcoming in a week or two, and there are rumors that the Conservatives mean to unite their forces with the Obstructionists in resisting its passage. This resistance would have been overcome readily had the sympathy for Irish wrongs which was undoubtedly felt by the English Liberals when Mr. Gladstone took office not been cooled or turned into exasperation by the outrageous performances of the Land League, and by the parliamentary blunder of Parnell and his followers. A peaceful strike against rent would not have been considered unjustifiable; but the reckless language of Parnell and his coadjutors stimulated outrages, and outrages brought coercion and turned the tide of English sympathy, and now the prospect is by no means very bright, considering Mr. Gladstone's age and the drafts which his burning activity makes on his strength, and the dependence of the Liberal party on him both for cohesion and initiative. The Land League is apparently suffering heavily from Davitt's arrest and Parnell's absence, for Parnell has gone away again in pursuit of French sympathy—as if that could do him any good if he got it. The removal of the funds, too, to parts unknown, and the non-publication of accounts are naturally exerting a depressing influence on the unfortunate contributors who have to stay at home and face the landlords and police. There is now much danger of renewed evictions under cover of the Coercion Bill, and fresh savagery is likely to be infused into them by the operations of a Tory "Emergency Committee," which is engaged in providing English and Scotch tenants for vacant farms, an enterprise which may fairly be called devilish.

MR. HAYES'S ADMINISTRATION.

BY the time this reaches our readers Mr. Hayes will have retired to private life, after an Administration in some ways the most remarkable and trying in American history, because he is the only President who has held office under a disputed title. The action of the Electoral Commission justified him in accepting the office; the vote of the Electoral College would not, as we maintained at the time, have done so, because it was clearly tainted with fraud. But, of course, the action of the Electoral Commission could not do more than make it decent for him to take the Presidency; it could not give him in the eyes either of friends or foes the moral weight and dignity which flow from election by unquestioned returns. The defect in his position being a moral one, however, the only possible palliative for it—cure there was none—was the diligent cultivation of moral strength, and the resolute avoidance of all courses which seemed likely to deepen the suspicion which clouded his accession to office. He was, however, so ill-advised that he did not see this. He actually came to the conclusion, as soon as he entered the White House—we do not know under what influence—that his first duty was, not, by an exhibition of unswerving integrity, to relieve the honest souls all over the country who had supported him with misgiving, “for the sake of the party,” but to provide the Louisiana and Florida politicians who had counted him in with substantial rewards for their services. As soon as he did this he delivered himself into the hands of his enemies; he discarded the warranty which he had received from the Electoral Commission, and confessed obligation to the Returning Boards. Under the best of circumstances, it would have been hard for him to live up to the standard of reform set out in his letter of acceptance; after this fatal compliance it became impossible. He could only have conquered by the aid of a sincerity which no man dared to doubt. After using the civil service to reward the Southern Republican counters, his enemies were able to deny his sincerity with the aid of proofs which his warmest friends found it difficult to meet. In fact, the battle was lost before a shot had been fired. That he had no strength to spare, even at the outset, for anything but the work cut out for him by the platform and his own letter of acceptance, we were fully persuaded as soon as he was nominated. On the 22d of June, 1876, commenting on the nomination, we said:

“But Mr. Hayes, though by no means conspicuous in politics, is not wholly unknown, and we presume there are few, even of those who know him best and like him most, who do not doubt whether he is the kind of man for which the crisis through which we are now passing calls. The civil-service plank in the platform, though doubtless well meant, has, in its declaration that senators and representatives should confine themselves to their legitimate duties and refrain from influencing appointments, a ludicrous resemblance to the resolution introduced into the French National Assembly calling on all the rascals to quit France. It brings strikingly to mind the great fact, that to get rid of the master-evil of the Government in our day—that which has already degraded and paralyzed it, and threatens it with serious fundamental changes at no very remote date—the President must be a man of no ordinary tenacity and breadth of view, and must be prepared to sacrifice personal ease and smoothness of administration, and party harmony and success, to higher and more important things. We do not believe, with our present knowledge, that Mr. Hayes is such a man. We do not know, for we have no reason for believing, that he thinks the condition of the civil service a serious evil, that he would make great sacrifices to amend it, or that he thinks anything of more importance to the country than the supremacy of the Republican party, managed substantially as it now is. Let us not be misunderstood. We have no doubt he will surround himself with a respectable Cabinet; that his secretaries of state will never be chance acquaintances made in the railroad-cars or at dinner-parties; that his associates will be men of honor and education; that he will be in good relations with the intellectual and moral as well as the material interests of the country; that he will not tolerate thieves and theft in his immediate view and presence; and that he will be the enemy of all kinds of jobbery. But this he might be and do for four or eight years without permanently or even sensibly reforming the Government, or removing one of its Oriental features, and without checking that growing tendency to rely on individuals rather than on laws for the salvation of the Government which is the great danger and difficulty of the day. It will be seen that we do not seek to conceal his good points, but we fear that it is these very points which make him objectionable at this juncture. We fear that he will, if elected, send the nation to sleep again, to wake up once more in four or eight years to look for a ‘truly good man’ to save it from the whiskey-

thieves and the speculators and jobbers and ringsters. This reliance on special providences is the sign, however, not of healthy but of morbid politics; and the truly great man and the real reformer will be he who will bring about the revolution which will render great men unnecessary, and make the type to which Mr. Hayes belongs sufficient for all needs of the state.”

It was not simply by his needless sacrifice of his influence for the benefit of the Returning Boards that he confirmed this view. He confirmed it still more strongly by his management of his Cabinet. Only one of its members has shown, or attempted to show, that he cared one straw about the reform over which Mr. Hayes was most strenuous when he took office, and one of them has in every way shown his indifference to it apparently without meeting with one word of rebuke from his superior. It may be said that Mr. Hayes submitted to all this because he could not help it, but his condemnation lies in the fact that he thought he could help it. There is no more serious defect in a statesman than inability to estimate his own powers, or, to use the homely phrase, readiness to “put up more machinery than he has boiler for.”

That his Administration has been very pure as contrasted with that of his predecessor, there is no doubt. Its freedom from all scandals, and the general sweetness of the social atmosphere with which it has surrounded the White House, must always give it strong claims on public gratitude. In this way, too, it has rendered very important service to the party. There can hardly be a question that it is to this that General Garfield owes his small majority. But, after all, it will be impossible to decide before seeing the kind of Administration General Garfield gives us whether it was a misfortune or a gain that the Republicans retained the Presidency in 1876. If it gave the party a chance to establish other claims on popular confidence than the successful conduct of the war, of which it will avail itself, the decision of the Electoral Commission was a lucky thing for the country. If, on the other hand, it simply ousted Mr. Tilden to enable General Garfield, after a sort of Hayes interregnum, to restore and perpetuate the Boss régime set up under General Grant, it probably simply postponed for eight years the Democratic accession to power. And assuredly when the Democrats do come into power, if they come before long, they will find in the history of Mr. Hayes's Administration plenty of excuse for persistence in the practices which were the disgrace of Grant's. It is true Mr. Hayes leaves behind some good precedents, such as the withdrawal of the New York Custom-house and Post-office from politics, but it is one of the misfortunes of a President's position, as it is of a clergyman's, that when he sets up as a reformer he cannot afford a single lapse from virtue. He has to be a reformer, as they say in the conventions, “first, last, and all the time” in order to save himself from the reproach of hypocrisy. We have reached a stage in the history of the country when, owing to the great strides made in population and industry, we are threatened with a distinct change in the form and spirit of the Government, through the use of the civil service, in connection with the nominating system, for building up a power in the Senate unknown to the Constitution and dangerous both to purity and liberty. The movement can only be arrested by a President of indomitable energy and strength of will, who relies on and is supported by an aroused public opinion. We shall probably see more than one offer himself for the task and lose heart after putting his hand to the plough; but the right man will at last appear, and when he does people will be surprised by the ease with which he will do the work.

CONGRESS AND THE BANKS.

THE sort of panic created by the section of the Funding Bill which proposed to compel National banks that wished to withdraw their circulating notes, to collect them and pay them into the Treasury before receiving back the bonds pledged as security for them, instead of redeeming them in “lawful money” of any kind, will probably, in whatever way it ends, have two very useful results. It will bring home to the public, with a force and impressiveness which no amount of mere preaching could have, the exceeding inconvenience and danger which lie in arming Congress with the power of interference with the currency. It will, in addition to this, give Congress itself a useful lesson in finance. It was in this way precisely that Congressmen learnt the real nature of

the "premium on gold," as it was called during the war. When this premium first began to rise high it found the majority in Congress possessed with the old notion of the Continental Congress, that the depreciation of Government paper was due to the machinations of speculators, and that it could be prevented by punishing persons who tried to sell it for less than the value which patriotic persons thought it ought to have. On this topic Thaddeus Stevens had more authority in the eyes of the Republican members than all the financiers in the world; a bill introduced by him sending gold speculators to jail was passed without difficulty. It was repealed, however, after fifteen days, when it was shown by actual experiment that it made the premium on gold higher than ever, and no attempt was ever again made to raise the Government credit by penal legislation. This could not have been brought about by any display of the recorded experience of other generations and other nations. The ordinary Congressman is seldom satisfied about any financial problem without trying its solution himself. He has an exhilarating and deep-seated belief that with his appearance in the House or Senate a new era in human affairs has begun, and that human society lies before him, like a sheet of white paper, ready for anything he likes to write on it. In most fields his experiments only affect a small number of persons or of interests; but when he takes hold of the currency he is able to disarrange the whole social machinery, send terror or foreboding into every household in the country, lower the value of every man's property, and bring ruin on every variety of business enterprises. Luckily he is as easily frightened as a boy playing with explosives, and runs away at the first blast of danger, and thus far the country has suffered little from the really momentous fact that he has its money in his power. This security, however, has only been purchased by great and protracted exertions on the part of the public. A fortunate veto from General Grant prevented Congress from inflating the Government paper in a way which would probably have finally resulted in bankruptcy, and it was only by a combination of cajolery and hoodwinking that it was induced to permit the resumption of specie payments. In fact, it probably never would have created the resumption machinery if it had felt sure it would work. It provided it because it thought it would amuse the hard-money men and do nobody else any harm.

Those who have been long possessed with the belief (and Mr. Sherman is amongst the number) that it would do to entrust the Secretary of the Treasury with the management of a huge bank of issue, by directing the Treasury to engage in the permanent emission of paper money under the superintendence of Congress, must surely be enlightened and warned by the history of the Funding Bill. The bill is necessary; and it may be that in fixing the rate of interest at three per cent., even though the weight of financial opinion is against it, the majority in the House have not overestimated the strength of the national credit. But they could not bear to pass it without inserting in it "a dig" at the national banks, which have long been the *bête noire* not only of the inflationists, who wish to see all paper money issued by Government, but of all that class of demagogues, principally Democrats, who look on persons engaged in the introduction and diffusion of capital in this country as public enemies, whom it is the duty of the legislator to vex by every means within his reach. It is to be observed, too, that the stroke at the banks contained in the fifth section was not inserted on the suggestion of any member known to the country as an experienced financier, whose conclusions on any business matter command respect or attention. The provision which has come near producing a panic, and would have produced one if men's engagements and commitments had been a little further increased by a longer continuance of the present period of prosperity, was, it appears, the work of a gentleman named Carlisle, from Kentucky, of whom the country outside his own district has heard for the first time in connection with this extraordinary mistake, of whose competence for financial legislation nothing whatever was known, and who apparently has hardly any acquaintance with business machinery or the working of business motives. If he had, he would have foreseen at a glance what the banks would do when his device seemed likely to become a law. As a matter of fact, it has taken him wholly by surprise, and the only excuse he can offer is that he meant well. There is no other commercial nation in the world in which such a suggestion would be accepted from anybody but a man of national reputation,

charged with the responsibility of the financial administration of the Government.

The national banking system is the one piece of legislation produced during the war period on which we may look with unmixed satisfaction. The suggestion of it, of course, came from the banking system of this State, but, considering the confusion of the times in which it was produced, its efficiency as a means of furnishing a safe and elastic national currency is very remarkable, and something of which the country may be justly proud. In so far as this legislation makes provision for the safety of the note-holders and depositors of the banks it may be pronounced almost perfect. It ensures the note-holders absolutely against loss, and it ensures the depositors against loss as far as a good system of inspection backed up by legal penalties can do it. The banks are cut off from every kind of business and every mode of doing business which are at all likely to diminish the security of those who commit money to their keeping. Now, when the Government has done these things it has done all that it ought to do. Any power of interference with the banks or their business which is not necessary for these things it ought not to have and cannot safely be permitted to have. "All attempts to convert the banks into state functionaries or agents, or treat them as such, have the seeds of mischief in them, as the events of the past fortnight show. The "Carlisle amendment" undoubtedly had its origin in a reminiscence of the circumstances under which the national banks were started. They were started largely as a means of disposing of a mass of Government bonds during the war, and this fact, coupled with the strange interpretation which many people put on the word "creature" when they use the phrase that a "corporation is the creature of the law," has left behind a strong tradition that one of the functions of the national banks is the "floating" or absorption of Government bonds. When any fresh issue of Government bonds which does not seem likely to be popular, such as bonds at a very low rate of interest, is projected, one of the first things of which many a Western statesman thinks is the means by which they can be forced on the national banks or by which the national banks can be made to distribute them. In like manner, when the issue of depreciated silver coin was resolved on, the refusal of the banks to receive it except as a special deposit—that is, their refusal to allow persons who deposited silver only to draw out gold or greenbacks—was actually treated in Congress and by a portion of the Western press as an act of "rebellion" and as a "defiance" of the Government, just as if the banks were bound by their charters to help to carry out every financial scheme, however wild, the majority in Congress might devise. In the agitation against the railroads, too, the phrase "creature of the law," which was so freely applied to corporations, had the effect at last of persuading many people that the property of the corporation—which has all the incidents and immunities of individual property—really belongs to the Government, and is only handled by its nominal owners on sufferance or as a sort of favor. Consequently not only are the banks thought of by large numbers in and out of Congress as owing some kind of duty to the Government not set down in the Bank Acts, but as being in a certain sense managers of Government property, which Congress may deal with in any manner it pleases.

The banks, however, owe no duty to the Government except obedience to the provisions of the various Banking Acts; and the object of these acts is to permit the carrying on of the "business of banking by discounting and negotiating promissory notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt; by receiving deposits; by buying and selling exchange, coin, and bullion; by loaning money on personal security; and by obtaining, issuing, and circulating notes" under the provisions of the law. No bank is, however, obliged to do all of these things. It may do any of them it pleases. It is not even bound to issue circulating notes. It is simply "entitled" to do so if it pleases. It is not bound to receive deposits in silver, or in anything else, unless it pleases and thinks it profitable. It is not bound to assist in "placing" Government securities, and owes the Government no more fealty or service than any other business corporation. The *raison d'être* of the banks is the making of money through the accommodation of the public on the capital invested in them by their stockholders. The object of the Government's connection with them is simply the security of the public against loss. It is very like the connection of the Board of Health with house-

builders. It is in no sense a business or political partnership, and we shall never have safe banking until the idea that the banks have any political function has disappeared from the public mind. Therefore it is the duty of those bank directors who think that the operation of the Carlisle amendment, by compelling them to redeem their bonds with their own bills, instead of, as provided by the original bill, with any "lawful money," would be injurious to their stockholders, to withdraw their circulation now before the Funding Bill takes effect. They owe this to their stockholders and depositors. They are bound to act in the matter on purely business considerations; there is no place in sound banking for any other consideration either towards the Government or anybody else. All talk of their trying to "bully the Government," because they refuse to share in the risk of carrying out the Carlisle experiment, has a very odd sound in a business community. The more reckless or sentimental Congress is in dealing with the finances of the country, the more imperatively are the banks bound to stand on business ground and work under business motives. They would become most unsafe and even dangerous institutions if they allowed themselves to occupy the position of the agents of political experimentation about currency or the public credit. A bank president who acted at such a crisis under a patriotic or other sentimental impulse would prove himself unfit for his position. He has no right to be patriotic or public-spirited with other people's money or at other people's expense. He has no right to assist in placing Government bonds if the process is, in his eyes, likely to entail loss or embarrassment on the institution which is in his immediate charge. The success of Government loans is the concern of Congress and the Treasury. The safety of the funds of his own bank is the concern of each banker.

THE NEW STAGE "AMERICAN."

THE play of "Fresh, the American," now running at the Park Theatre, differs in almost every respect from the American comedies which have preceded it. It is a wild melodrama, reeking with improbabilities, in which the American, *Mr. F. N. Fresh*, of the New York Stock Board, is introduced in the midst of European surroundings and in contact and contrast with European and Oriental characters. The facts upon which it is announced to have been founded are as follows: That some years ago several of the daughters of high Egyptian officials were sent, by order of the Khedive, to Paris to receive a French education; that in 1879 the Khedive was expelled from his kingdom and sailed with his harem and suite on his steam-yacht to Naples, and there purchased and occupied a palace into which he removed his harem and attendants; that less than a year since a young girl eloped from his harem with a foreigner with whom she had fallen in love. Out of these simple historical materials the author has manufactured a thrilling drama of adventure, love, and revenge. In the first act the scene is laid at Nice, in the *Hôtel des Anglais*, and we here make the acquaintance of an Italian *Marchesa*, who has buried three husbands and desires a fourth; a young Egyptian Princess, *Erema*, daughter of *Achmet Pasha*, who has received a French education and is emancipated from the traditions of the East on the subject of her sex and its position; a Russian officer, whose brother was murdered after surrendering at Plevna, and who has only two passions—love for the *Marchesa* and a thirst for the lives of all Turks, but especially for that of his brother's murderer; *Mahomet Ali*, an officer of the Egyptian army and really the murderer of the Russian officer's brother; *Achmet Pasha*, chief officer of the ex-Khedive of Egypt; *Mathias Manassah*, a Jew banker and financial agent of the Khedive in Europe; and finally *Mr. Fresh* himself, who is privately married to *Erema*. The *Marchesa*, filled with the determination of becoming the wife of the rich American, intrigues to get rid of *Erema*, and has her taken off by her father and married to *Mahomet Ali*. The action of the play consists in the frustration of this intrigue and the final recovery of *Erema* through the wonderful energy, perseverance, and indomitable pluck of her American husband; the whole ending in the gardens of the ex-Khedive on the Bay of Naples, where, while an eruption of Vesuvius is going on in the background, the foreground is suddenly filled with the gallant crew of *Mr. Fresh's* yacht, the *Greenback*, who, with the assistance of the yacht's cook, overpower the nearly triumphant Egyptians and rescue the hero and his bride.

There is nothing in the play itself, nor in the acting of the European and Eastern characters, to explain the success with which it has met. All of the newspapers on its first production severely criticised or ridiculed it as a dramatic product; nevertheless it draws crowded houses, and is evidently going to have a long run, owing to the acting of the American part of *Fresh* by Mr. Raymond. He is so good an actor that there is nothing remarkable in his carrying off, as he has done before now, a bad play. What is worth noticing

about his present performance is that the type of American character presented in it is altogether new on the stage, and that it is the truth of the type which so greatly excites the delight of the audience. *Mr. Fresh* is a member of the New York Stock Board. He has made a fortune of millions by "consolidation," and these he goes to Europe to enjoy. His qualities of character are very marked and they are all entirely anti-European. He is, in the first place, a citizen of a country without a past, and consequently the feeling of reverence for the past is not simply wholly lacking in him, but its place is supplied by something like a good-natured contempt for antiquity. The sight of Cleopatra's Needle produces in him no lofty emotions or sentiments, but he is profoundly struck with the fact that it has no "eye." He familiarly abbreviates the names of all the venerable objects and places with which he comes in contact. As he has no reverence for the past, neither has he any regard, in his intercourse with persons invested by European traditions with a personal dignity, for the respect due them. He slaps *Achmet Pasha* on the back and brings down immense applause by calling him "*Ach*." In fact, he treats the chief officer of the Khedive (and this is the touch of nature which goes to the heart of the audience) precisely as he might if he were "one of the boys" who turn up in the office of the Windsor Hotel to do a little evening business after any particularly exciting day at "the Board." There used to be a story of an American captain whose vessel, while lying at Civita Vecchia in 1848-9, is supposed to be boarded by the Pope of Rome and King of Naples. On receiving his distinguished visitors he says, "How d'y'e do, King; how d'y'e do, Pope. Mr. Smith, you just take the King down to the cabin and let him have something to drink, while I show the Pope round the deck." This story would hardly have been accepted by an American audience at that period as a good illustration of American manners, but it is just this tone of monstrous familiarity and disrespect which in *Fresh* the audience recognizes and applauds.

These traits of character are not pleasing to everybody, and the theatrical critic of the *Times* pronounces *Mr. Fresh* "a conceited, boorish, impolite, offensive, and utterly repulsive donkey," and a "vulgar castaway from Wall Street." But this is really a mistake. It is an attempt to describe *Mr. Fresh* in the terms of a code which is inapplicable. He is anything but a donkey; for he is a shrewd, observing man of the world, always able to take care of himself under any circumstances. His vulgarity, too, is by no means what the term and its associations imply among Europeans. He is not mean, or close, or "caddish." On the contrary he is generous, brave, and chivalrous towards women. His bravery, however, it should be said, is not connected with or supported by the sentiments which according to European notions are inseparable from it. He has no sense of insults, and when the Russian officer endeavors to fasten a quarrel upon him by staring him out of countenance he only tells him to "glare away," and finally with great good humor engages him in a glaring-match. According to European notions, a brave man must not only be brave, but he must never seem to be anything else. Such is not *Mr. Fresh's* view of the subject. He runs away in the face of danger without the slightest hesitation, if he thinks it is for his interest to do so, and here again the audience marks its approval of his good sense by applause.

We have said that he is chivalrous to women, but that is not precisely the proper word in *Mr. Fresh's* case, for he is altogether devoid of the sentiment generally connected with the idea of chivalry. He does not worship woman in the abstract, or entertain any romantic ideas with respect to her. He knows that there are all sorts of women in the world, and would probably see little reason for idealizing the traits of character they have in common. In his relations with the *Marchesa*, whom he finally "sells short" to *Achmet Pasha* for the *Khedive's* account, he is governed by purely practical considerations. Another of his virtues is constancy. He comes of a strictly monogamous race, and, absurd as the play is, the audience derives a real satisfaction throughout from the excellence of his character in this respect. He trifles with no one. He does not pretend to be in love with the *Marchesa*, but is governed throughout by that spirit of fidelity in love which Tacitus, Taine, and other writers have pointed out as one of the strongly-marked characteristics of all the Teutonic races, whether in the forests of Germany or the civilized homes of modern Anglo-Saxondom. It is pleasing to find this primitive trait strongly displayed in one who so distinctly belongs to the modern world as *Mr. Fresh*. Another virtue is his humanity. Any suggestion of cruelty, particularly cruelty to the weak and defenceless, rouses his indignation, and it is really on this subject alone that he feels indignation at all. Other forms of immorality may excite his curiosity, his interest, or his sense of humor; it is inhumanity alone which makes him indignant.

What chiefly draws the audience in *Fresh* is, of course, his humor; on the stage we do not insist upon refinement, and *Fresh* is not refined. He is about as delicate as the "end-man" of a negro-minstrel troupe, but he is a humorist of a different order. The period since the war has witnessed the disappearance of several old American types of character and the development of some very novel ones. The Yankee whom Jefferson used to play in the "American Cousin," before the part of *Dundreary* came into prominence as the central figure in Sothorn's hands, with his solemn manner, his nasal

twang, his unfamiliarity with other countries and customs than his own, his half-nervous national consciousness, his absurd costume, already belongs to the past. *Solon Shingle*, the degraded village Yankee of the same period, is seldom acted any longer. The reason is that the Yankee type itself has disappeared in the country. There is hardly a single trait in the typical American of to-day that is not the opposite of the traits of the Yankee period. The Yankee was close about money; the American is known all over the world for his lavish expenditure. *Fresh* opens the play by breaking the bank at Monaco, travels through Europe in his yacht *Greenback*, and thinks nothing of paying a hundred thousand francs for the jewels of the ex-Khedive of Egypt. He is enormously rich, and has made his money, as we have said, not by any tedious, monotonous labor and economy, but by brilliant operations in stocks, so that he is a millionaire and a young man at one and the same time. This has always been an ideal of the melodrama. It is one of the constant possibilities of actual life in America, and is one of the things which excite the warm admiration of the house. The audience is evidently composed very largely of the kind of Americans of which *Fresh* is the type. It is not in the least a fashionable audience. You look about in vain for the faces of the people you are accustomed to see at "first nights" at Wallack's, for instance; but it is an audience which is perfectly familiar with every term used on "the Street." If Jay Gould were "running" the theatre in connection with his many other enterprises, and had filled the boxes with "large operators," the orchestra chairs with "strong holders," and the galleries with "two-cent brokers" and "weak holders," he could not possibly get together a more appreciative and intelligent assemblage.

The late James Fisk used to say of his father, that while he would not tell a lie for ninenpence, he would tell eight for a dollar—a story which pleasantly illustrated the family love of truth, and brought out in a strong light the difference between the commercial spirit of the two generations. Fisk's father was a Yankee of the *Solon Shingle* period; but this type did not outlive the war. It is since the surrender at Appomattox that the stock-broking type of which Fisk was, in a certain sense, a pioneer, has been so enormously developed. A financier who would draw a distinction between telling a lie for ninenpence and telling eight for a dollar, was a product of country life. He could derive a great deal of quiet, rural humor out of a "bar'l of applesass." But *Solon Shingle*'s children are cosmopolitan humorists. They belong to the new America brought into being by the war. Although not themselves warriors, they have the confidence, the audacity, the recklessness naturally produced by war. They are necessarily brokers or "operators," for it is only on "the Street" that this sort of national type could be developed. The curious thing about it is that it should actually be a national type. We defy any native American to go to the Park Theatre and see Mr. Raymond's *Fresh* without sharing the peculiar enjoyment that the audience gets from it. It is an exaggeration, but it is an exaggeration based on facts. We do live, as no other people in the world ever lived, in an atmosphere of "operations," "consolidations," and "combinations." We are all more or less interested in the rise and fall of stocks. We all have some broker who is our great man, at whose word stocks rise and fall, who is able to ruin his enemies by "disquieting rumors" and enrich his friends by means of opportune "points." We all know too well what "putting up margins" and "covering our shorts" and "laying down on our contracts" mean. Our varied rights and duties arising upon "puts," "calls," and "options" are subjects which constantly occupy our thoughts. A generation ago it was a question how far transactions of this sort had any validity at all. Now we look for the latest decisions of the Court of Appeals on "straddles" as among the most important contributions of our tribunals of last resort to commercial law. Before the war, and down to a comparatively recent period, the "operator" was an object of public detestation; and Jay Gould himself, who is now respectfully called "Mr. Gould," and approached by all with a kind of awe, and interviewed as an authority on the rights of corporations, was daily denounced as a "pal" of Fisk's, and frequently had to hide in interior offices or run for his life to the shelter of a cab. Jay Gould cannot have materially changed in character since those days. He must be the same man who caused "Black Friday," made money tight, depressed stocks, plundered the Erie Railway, corrupted judges, and led for years an outlaw's life. If the operations which caused him then to be regarded as a public enemy cause him now to be set down as almost a public benefactor, it must be in a measure because we are all living, not merely in "flush" times, but in times in which the rising tide of prosperity seems to be partly caused by these very operations which are made possible by it.

THE AQUEDUCTS OF ANCIENT ROME.

ROME, February 4, 1881.

THE well-printed and well-illustrated quarto volume of four hundred pages whose title I subjoin is the most important recent work on the archaeology of the ancient capital of the world. It is by the engineer Ro-

dolfo Lanciani of Rome, and it received, as it well merited, the prize of ten thousand francs offered by his majesty the King of Italy, and adjudged to the author by the Royal *Accademia dei nuovi Lincei*. It is based on the treatise of Frontinus, "De Aquæductibus Urbis Romæ," and may be described as a perpetual commentary on the text of that important work. Frontinus, who lived in the first century of our era, enumerates nine aqueducts (five of the Republican, four of the Imperial period), being all that Rome possessed up to that date. The number was considerably increased afterwards, but there do not appear to have been any significant changes in the plans and methods of construction. The rules and principles laid down by Frontinus are applicable to later Roman hydraulic structures, and the work presented by Signor Lanciani* is the fullest and most satisfactory account we possess of the arrangements for furnishing water to supply the vast consumption of ancient Rome.

Of all the cities of the Greek and Roman world, Rome was most abundantly provided with water, the importance of which element, in its domestic and sanitary aspects, is now again, after centuries of neglect, beginning to be recognized as paramount among the physical conditions of urban life. We have, however, not yet quite learned to allow to water, as affecting the health, comfort, and decencies of life, the position which was accorded to it at Rome; but even to us it is inconceivable how many great cities of mediæval and even of modern ages could have existed, and been considered as elegant and refined abodes, with no artificial, or at best most inadequate, arrangements for the introduction and distribution of water among the people. Even Paris, in some sort the *arbitrator elegantiarum* of modern Europe, until recently derived its supply of drinking water from the Seine, the grand recipient of the sewage of Paris, and from wells polluted by infiltration, and so late as 1836 Parent Duchâtelet published a work in which the water of the Seine was proved to be altogether inoffensive to the taste and wholesome, because the foul matter contributed to its current by the superficial and subterranean drainage of the city was not sufficient in quantity to affect sensibly the taste, the limpidity, or the salubrity of its waters!

The ancient Romans discriminated carefully between the waters of different springs. What tests they employed we in general know as little as we know their rules for judging of the quality of stone and other materials employed in architecture. After the great natural division of water into fresh and salt, the most obvious distinction was between cold and hot springs. The latter of these were everywhere sought, and in all the wide domain of imperial Rome there is to be found scarcely a single spring above the ordinary temperature which is not surrounded by the ruins of old constructions obviously designed for bathing. They also considered the specific gravity of drinking-water a matter of much importance. A letter of Synesius to Hypatia describes and recommends an instrument for testing the weight of water. This was simply a graduated brazen tube, closed and weighted at one end. This, of course, by the height at which the tube stood in the fluid, would answer for comparing the gravity of different waters. Chemistry had not yet taught natural philosophers that water, even in its simplest form, is not an elemental but a compound substance; they knew, however, that not only spring-water, but even the purest rain-water, contains, in suspension or in solution, a variety of foreign ingredients.

Much of the water introduced into Rome by the aqueducts was employed for feeding fountains—the younger Pliny speaks of a *jet d'eau*—as well as for domestic uses; but the principal object of these constructions was to supply water for bathing, for which an enormous quantity was required. Thus the aqueducts subserved the purposes of luxury as well as the necessities of life. Cast-iron being scarcely known to the Romans, the distribution of the water from the reservoirs was effected by pipes of baked clay, and, where those were not applicable, of lead; and it is singular that, though skilful in casting bronze, the Roman founders were not yet able to cast lead pipe. The conduits of this material are made from cast sheets, or rather plates, of lead, wrapped around a mandrel and riveted or clamped at the opposite edges. The plates being thicker than modern rolled lead, the pipes were heavier, and accordingly the consumption of that metal was very great. From one single point of distribution of an aqueduct the Borghese family took, in the sixteenth century, not less than forty thousand pounds of lead pipe. The citadel of Alatri was supplied with water carried across a deep ravine by an inverted siphon of earthen pipes, imbedded in concrete, to a height of more than three hundred feet above the bottom of the ravine, and, of course, under a pressure of fully ten atmospheres.

Until comparatively recent times, the Romans were popularly believed to have been ignorant of the principle that water in conduits open only at the end will rise to the height of its source; but the discovery of distributing pipes at Pompeii and elsewhere, and careful study of the methods of employing them, have shown that they understood that law as well as we, and practically were much in advance of the engineers of some great cities of modern

* "I Comentarîi di Frontino intorno le Acque e gli Aquedotti; Silloge Epigrafica Aquaria. Memoria di Rodolfo Lanciani." Roma: Col tipi del Salviucchi. 1880. 400 pp. 4to.

times, who, after having constructed costly aqueducts to convey, and reservoirs to contain, water from distant sources, have been unable to devise any better method of distributing it among the population than the rude expedient of employing water-bearers to carry it about the streets, in casks or skins, upon their backs. Modern science has, indeed, disclosed to us many natural laws unknown to the Romans, but it is now certain that, though they were able to utilize for mechanical purposes only the simplest applications of some elastic, and probably none of the explosive, forces, and, of course, knew nothing of the steam-engine or of gunpowder, yet the methods employed by their engineers were often surprisingly like those of our own times. However erroneous the theories of ancient physicists may have been, their processes were almost always admirable, and they employed with great skill methods the rationale of which, as expounded by themselves, was as absurd as are the principles of Chinese medicine.

The Commentaries of Frontinus are confined principally to positive statements, and bear little of the hearsay and uncritical character of the 'Encyclopædia' of the elder Pliny. There is no danger, therefore, that the professional student of Frontinus will be misled by vague speculation, and I can recommend the study of Signor Lanciani's labors as likely to be eminently profitable to modern hydraulic engineers.

G. P. M.

Correspondence.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY ON THE JEWISH QUESTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nineteenth Century* there is an article by Mr. Lucien Wolf, the editor of the *Jewish World*, entitled "A Jewish View of the Anti-Jewish Agitation," in which, to my surprise, I find myself set down as having commenced the agitation in England. I was not aware that there had been an anti-Jewish agitation in England.

When we were on the brink of a war with Russia, and the Jews were doing their best, with all their organs and influence, to thrust us in, it became necessary to point out that they had trivial interests and quarrels of their own with which England had nothing to do, and that they could not be safely allowed to sway English councils. It might be necessary in the same way to scrutinize the political conduct of the Roman Catholics with regard to any question in which the Papacy was concerned. Mr. Wolf avows that the Jews all over the world denounced and opposed what he calls "the hypocritical designs" of Russia. Perhaps Russia might retort the epithet, inasmuch as Mr. Wolf lets it be clearly seen that her real offence was not her ambition, but her protection of the Eastern Christians against whom the Jews had a grudge. People who knew Rumania well, and who were not Christians but Agnostics, told us that the Rumanians had suffered as much from extortion as the Jews had from persecution, and that the persecution was the consequence of the extortion, as there can be little doubt it often was in the Middle Ages. But at all events this was a Jewish question, and not one about which we felt inclined to have England dragged into a Russian war.

As a journalist I heartily advocated the enfranchisement of the Jews, and if need were I would do it again, though I cannot say that people who regard the rest of the community as Gentiles, and refuse intermarriage with them, are the very best of candidates for citizenship. But now the Jews have political power with a vast money power to back it, and they must expect that their use of it will be watched. They have no right, when we guard ourselves against their tribal bias, to say that we are renewing the persecutions of the Middle Ages. The persecutions of the Middle Ages belong to the past, like the massacre of the Canaanites by the Jews. The Jews were not before the rest of the world in preaching religious liberty. Their law makes death the penalty of blasphemy and religious perversion.

The German agitation is a different affair. It seems to me to be essentially a conflict of race, for which the Jew, who makes race a religion, is at least in part responsible. Put any other two nationalities, strongly contrasted in character, in the same situation and you will have the same bad result. When the Jews lay aside tribalism and intermarry with their Gentile fellow-citizens, the conflict will gradually subside.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

TORONTO, Feb. 25.

THE REFORM TRIUMPH IN PHILADELPHIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I beg to say the reform in our city politics, as indicated by our recent election, was not "blundered into." The majority of the Committee of One Hundred always knew what reform meant and how to get it. Some members of that Committee, "men of property and standing," favored the renomination of Mr. Stokley, whose management of the police force saved us from serious

trouble in the summer of 1877. While they were of the opinion that he should be continued in the mayoralty they also desired reform, and his nomination by the Committee of One Hundred was secured by the assurance of Mr. A. J. Drexel that he (Stokley) would stand on the Committee's platform. Two very earnest reformers, Caven and Hunter, were put on the ticket with Stokley. Stokley's nomination by the Ring convention followed quickly, and then he repudiated the Committee's platform. It was then that Mr. Drexel and many of his friends resigned, probably feeling that they had been tricked, yet not willing to fuse with the Democrats. The remaining members of the Committee, a large majority, promptly made the fusion. Mr. Caven withdrew his name to make room for a Democrat, and you know the result.

I submit that the "sense of humor" as well as the victory remains with the intelligent and persistent majority of the Committee who did *not* resign, and whose candidate, a Democrat, was elected by 5,500 majority in a city honestly Republican by at least 22,000.

GRAYBEARD.

PHILADELPHIA, February 24, 1881.

[The resignations to which we referred were not the same as those which "Graybeard" mentions. Still, from better information we are convinced that we underrated the success of the anti-Ring movement in Philadelphia. The Committee has not dissolved, nor will it suspend operations till the eve of the next election. On the contrary, besides holding the balance of power, it aims and promises to be an active reformatory and supervisory body.—ED. NATION.]

WILL GENERAL GARFIELD PREPARE THE WAY FOR A DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT IN 1884?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your excellent and well-timed editorial, entitled "General Garfield and the Bosses," leads me to ask space in your columns for a brief remark.

Those who took the trouble to observe in November last must have been struck with the extreme looseness of the hold of the Republican party upon its voters. In saying this I set aside the declared "Independents," the so-called "Soreheads," and the like, and speak of the mass of the quiet and intelligent men who, since the breaking out of the war, have steadily voted on the Republican side, and with whom Republicanism seemed at one time to form almost an integral part of their characters. There were men of this sort, as I saw with surprise, who hesitated almost till the last day, finally voting for Garfield with a not very positive opinion that it might be best to do so. Amongst multitudes of Republicans the feeling seemed to be that they would vote once more for the candidate of their party, determined, however, that unless fully satisfied with the new Administration (if Republican) they would next time vote the other way should the Democrats select as good a candidate as Hancock. How very lightly Republicanism sits on many who aided to elect Garfield, sufficiently appears from the fact that this city, which in November gave Garfield 30,000 majority, has just elected a Democratic mayor by a majority of over 5,000.

If General Garfield believes that he cannot hope for a second term without the aid of the Bosses, it would be well for him also to realize that "harmony" with the Bosses during his term is likely to make it impossible not only for him but for any Republican to be elected in 1884.

Very truly,

M. C. L.

PHILADELPHIA, February 24, 1881.

DIVINATION BY BIRDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Eagle!—what does it portend? what significance can be attached to its movements, if any? Reading your valuable journal of Feb. 3, 1881, brought to my recollection a little incident that occurred at the battle of Fredericksburg. On the morning of the day of battle the weather was bright and pleasant. I was on the banks of the river with the late General Whipple, directing the crossing of my brigade upon pontoon bridges. As we sat upon our horses we had a fair view of the enemy's fortifications, from whence they were sending their iron hail of shot and shell into the Union army and the city just below us, and occasionally paying their respects to us. They were well posted and prepared. Why not? They had had full time given to do so, without hindrance, and we were now in the slaughter-pen so neatly arranged by them. The battle had fairly opened. The rattle of small arms and thunder of artillery were incessant from both sides. The smoke had gathered above the city in great volumes, and its apex gradually assumed the form of an "eagle" with outspread wings and tail; its head stretched southward. The form hovered for full five minutes above the Union forces, and then melted and slowly drifted away upon the air. I called General Whipple's attention to the strange appearance and asked what it portended. He remarked the "eagle" was perfect in appearance, and that if it portended anything the result of the

battle would solve it. The same remark would apply to the eagle alighting upon Garfield's house in Washington, D. C.—namely, that the result of General Garfield's Administration would solve it. Query: Has the symbol of our liberty abandoned its home in the forest and the free air of the heavens to lay down its shield and arrows and submit to the corporate monopolies that now control the Government of the nation under the "Boss" rule, and absorb the wealth of labor to its enslavement? As the *Presbyter* and *Herald* would say: Has Providence another lesson in store for our people? A.

MAC-A-CHEEP, LOGAN COUNTY, O., Feb. 23, 1881.

[The Garfield eagle simply portended his nomination. The omen which will indicate the character of his Administration will hardly appear until after the appointment of the Cabinet. If the Bosses are to have their way a strange dog will probably howl piteously on the Capitol steps, while if we are to have reform the figure of a new broom will appear in the clouds over the White House and be seen by thousands. —PRESBYTER AND HERALD OF THE NATION.]

THE CABINET AND CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: "J." of Norwalk, Conn., in your last, expresses the "hope that the *Nation* is not finally committed to a support of the Pendleton bill for giving the Cabinet seats in Congress." As I understand it, the Pendleton bill simply formulates an original suggestion of the *Nation*, and a suggestion freighted with so much wisdom as to commend itself instantly, as it were, to the thinking public. Provide seats in Congress for the members of the Cabinet, and require them to be in their seats on given days to make answers to the representatives of the people, and there will be no mere figure-heads filling those departments thereafter, but men of brains and exhaustive information on the needed points, coupled with the capabilities to measure swords in debate with the ablest leaders of the enemies of the Administration. The Administration will then be forced to surround itself with this class of men, or be humiliated before the country and the world. If the idea be original with the *Nation* (and that is as I understand it), the country owes it much for so great a move in the right direction; and whether original or not, none the less for its able championing of the plan. As you say in your last issue (page 108): "In truth there is no public interest which would not gain by the change."

J. D. J.

February 23, 1881.

DEARTH OF GREAT MEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In dipping into Mr. Jennings's entertaining 'Anecdotal History of the British Parliament' the other day (at p. 159), my eye happened on a passage referring to politicians, extracted from one of Burke's speeches. It was so much in accord with your editorial in No. 814 of the *Nation* on the "Disappearance of Great Men from Public Life" that I send it to you. The caution which it contains, coming from so great a political philosopher, is worthy of the attention of all pessimists who think the decadence in our public men is due to our having no great men, and none capable of greatness, and not to the present prerequisites for public life. Burke says:

"Because half-a-dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chink, while thousands of great cattle beneath the shadow of the British oak chew the cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field, that of course they are many in number, or that, after all, they are other than the little, shriveled, meagre, hopping, though loud and troublesome, insects of the hour."

Though the "importunate chink" of our political "grasshoppers" is now pretty incessant (witness the Dorsey dinner and the talk as to Garfield's Cabinet), perhaps a change may come. When the voices of these "insects of the hour," the Blainites, the Conklingites, the Dorseyites, the Grantites, and the Storrsites, and all the other "favorite son-ites," hoarsen with age or grow inarticulate, or their possessors die off, and our ears get peace, we may perhaps again hear the note of greatness in our public life. H. M.

CHICAGO, February 19, 1881.

DRUNKENNESS IN THE ARMY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your statement in the *Nation* of February 3, that "there is no worse offence [than drunkenness] in an army officer," leads me to ask if you or any of the readers of the *Nation* know it to be a fact that the raid of the Apache Victorio and his band in New Mexico for the past year and a half—a raid that has so far resulted in the killing of more than three hundred persons—was caused by a drunken army officer ordering his men to fire on that chief and his war-

riors at Ojo Caliente? I ask the question in good faith and for information. That the secondary, if not the primary, cause of this outbreak was drunkenness is very generally believed in this country. F. E. R.

GEORGETOWN, GRANT CO., NEW MEXICO, Feb. 13.

Notes.

HARPER & BROS. have reprinted Dr. Arthur Mitchell's original and able work, 'The Past in the Present: What is Civilization?' already reviewed in the *Nation* (No. 809).—'The Students' Helmholtz,' by John Broadhouse (London: Wm. Reeves; New York: Scribner & Welford), is a treatise on "Musical Acoustics," giving the results of the investigations of Helmholtz, Tyndall, A. J. Ellis, and other scientists. Helmholtz's great work on the sensations of tone has been admirably translated into English by Mr. Ellis, and its value increased by the addition of his painstaking researches, but its high price puts it out of the reach of a large class of students. Mr. Broadhouse's contains all the important facts and principles in acoustics a knowledge of which is requisite for passing the examinations for degrees in music at the universities of Cambridge or London, and more that is interesting to the general student of acoustical science than is contained in any of our text-books of physics.—In the handy 'Pocket Logarithms and other Tables,' arranged and accented by Lewis D'A. Jackson (London: Wm. H. Allen & Co.), an excess or deficiency of more than one-sixth of a unit in the last place of decimals of the four-place logarithms is indicated by a dot under the last figure or a dash over it. This device will be found useful to some persons, although the labor of using it is hardly less than that of working with an additional place of decimals. The table of four-place logarithms occupies, quite unnecessarily, no less than thirty-one pages, or more than a good five-place table. The "other tables" seem to be more adapted for insurance agents than for any other assignable class of persons.—J. P. Putnam's 'The Open Fire-place in All Ages' (Boston: Osgood) fills the need of a semi-popular treatise on the principles of heating dwelling-houses. For reasons which the author states fully, he gives the preference to the principle of the so-called "ventilating fire-place," claiming for it great economy in first cost and in fuel. His application of the principle is somewhat novel, and the artistic details are carefully studied and agreeably presented. There is much besides—as about the cause of smoky chimneys; ventilation of gas-jets; furnaces, and stoves. A beautiful series of plates exhibits mediæval and renaissance art as applied to fire-places. A second edition is expected shortly.—We are informed that a series of editions of Greek authors is in preparation, under the general editorship of Professors John W. White, of Harvard, and Packard, of Yale. The notes are to be in the main taken from those of one or the other of the two leading German serial editions, with such omissions or additions (the latter to be clearly indicated) as are required to adapt them to the use of American students and to the results of recent investigations. The books will appear in two forms, one with the notes under the text, the other with the text alone for those who prefer that form for the recitation-room. Ginn & Heath are the publishers.—By arrangement with Mr. Froude, Mr. Carlyle's literary executor, and his publishers, the Messrs. Longman, Charles Scribner's Sons will publish from advance sheets the 'Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle.'—G. P. Putnam's Sons will publish during the spring 'Co-operation as a Business,' by Charles Barnard; 'The Literary Art,' by John Albee; 'Sir John Franklin,' in the "Plutarch Series"; Rochefort's 'Mlle. de Bismarck'; and 'Broken Thoughts,' a volume of poems by "G. L. B." Later in the year they will bring out the third volume of Prof. Tyler's 'History of American Literature,' covering the Revolutionary period. The Messrs. Putnam have taken charge of the publications of the Civil-Service Reform Association, and are prepared to supply them on demand, and to give information concerning the work and methods of the Association. No. 2 of its publications is a reprint of Mr. Parton's chapter in the 'Life of Andrew Jackson' in which he gives an account of the beginning of the "spoils" system. It will well repay the perusal of those who fancy that this system was introduced as an escape from an officeholding aristocracy.—Cassell, Petter & Galpin announce a series of volumes to be known as "Cassell's Popular Library," beginning with a 'History of the Free-Trade Movement in England,' by Augustus Mongredien, and continued with 'Lives of the Covenanters,' Boswell's 'Johnson,' 'Life of Wesley,' 'Domestic Folk-Lore,' and 'American Humorists.'—Thomas Nelson & Sons fix the month of May as the date of their publication of the Revised New Testament, in styles and at prices to suit the popular demand.—The January Bulletin of the Boston Public Library contains a list of its collection of the curious and historically valuable publications known in Massachusetts as "Election Sermons" from 1638 to 1880. The annotations indicate also the years in which no sermon was preached, as by reason of small-pox in Boston, and in which those delivered were not printed, and serve to stimulate the search for such as may have escaped notice, or at least for the names of the fifteen unknown

preachers.—From the press of Julius Springer, Berlin, has been issued vol. ii. of Dr. H. von Holst's 'Constitutional History of the United States since Jackson's Administration' (*Verfassungsgeschichte*, etc.) It extends from the annexation of Texas to the Compromise of 1850. The author announces in his preface that a full index will be made to the completed work, and there is a marked improvement in the table of contents of the present volume.—According to the 'Brahmo Year-Book for 1880,' edited by Sophia Dobson Collet, Sen had a new revelation in 1880 of God as the "Mother of India." He also published a proclamation to his followers, styled "My Soldiers in India," and signed "Mother of India," in which it is stated that "the British Government is my government, the Brahmo Somaj my church; my daughter Queen Victoria have I ordained and set over the country to rule the people." The Brahmoists are said to be mostly young men graduates of the English Government schools, and Sen evidently aims in this divine proclamation to strengthen the hands of the English. There are also dark hints thrown out of actions on his part that look favorable to some idolatrous ceremonies, though complicity in them at the time of his daughter's marriage was denied by the French writer whom we referred to lately. Miss Collet has edited the 'Year-Book' for a number of years, and is an authority on the subject, having written also a number of books on this theistic and unitarian church. The new movement, the Sadhāran, is described in this manual.—The February *American Art Review* concludes Mrs. Van Rensselaer's essay on Mr. Chase with some just criticisms, as it seems to us, and for the rest contains a paper on Pueblo Pottery and, as usual, an excellent epitome of the art news of the month. The illustrations are unimportant.—Among the many articles upon George Eliot which have appeared since her death, that in the February *Cornhill* deserves special mention for its remark that George Eliot's favorite theme is "the woman in need of a confessor," and that her weakness consisted in assuming "the point of view of the confessor rather than of the artist."

—The judges of the Prang Christmas-card competition found their task very simple this year. Every one who visits the Exhibition at the American Art Gallery must agree substantially with their award of the first prize to Mr. Vedder, and the second to Miss Doris Wheeler, we should say; and no one will dispute the title of Miss Rosina Emmett and Mr. C. C. Coleman to the other two, although there is, perhaps, room here to question whether the former did not deserve the third instead of the fourth, which she got. The committee, however, were not only clear about the order, but recommended that the third prize be raised to the value of the second; so that the awards stand: Mr. Vedder, \$1,000; Miss Wheeler, \$500; Mr. Coleman, \$500; Miss Emmett, \$200. Mr. Vedder sent two designs, of which the prize-winner represented a young woman with ribbons flying from her head relieved against a light blue sky with white clouds, balanced by a scroll containing the figures "1882," the whole framed by a border of conventionalized leaves and flowers in light greens and blues and gold; in the second, a half-nude youthful Goddess of Fortune sits on her inclined wheel and extends her arms beneficently, the sun, itself in the shape of a wheel, shedding its cheery beams upon her the while. Either would be recognized anywhere as born of Mr. Vedder's fancy, but in the latter he has given a free rein to his turn for eccentricity, with the result that it is the oddity of the conceit rather than its agreeableness that strikes one first—and last. In the other he has apparently felt more respect for his idea, and has treated it with a deference which, quite as much as its obvious labels, gives it a thoroughly classical air; it need not be said that its individuality is, nevertheless, sufficiently preserved. To see the difference, and note the superiority of this one, it is only necessary to compare the two faces, which have a strong family likeness, but inclined in the one case to a rather ideal type and in the other accentuated, after Mr. Vedder's frequent fashion, in point of peculiarity—as if he wished it to enforce in some subtle way the unity of the conception, which would be all very well if his desire did not appear. In color both drawings are very charming, the tone of both being that of a distinctly refined and elegant order of decoration. This may be said, too, of Miss Wheeler's angels blowing tidings of good will through celestial trumpets. They are delicately drawn, and very different in idea from the conventional angel, the drapery clinging so closely as to follow lines of wholly terrestrial beauty, while their color, which is a light though not a pale green, is delightful, and the border, which imitates stamped leather, has a soft opaline effect that very few of our painters could match. Miss Emmett's young mother, standing erect and clasping her boy in her arms, is also a study in delicate tones (though these are less luminous), and shows drawing of noteworthy merit, in which respect it is firmer and truer than anything we have seen by her. It is likely, moreover, to prove quite as popular as the others, in virtue of the sweetness and humanity which it adds to very pleasant decorative qualities.

—What the exact test of merit in a Christmas card may be one is naturally at some loss to know. Possibly these competitions can be regarded as attempts to evolve the ideal type by selection of the fittest. Decorativeness is, of course, one of the first qualities to be insisted upon, and the special

commendation of Mr. Coleman's design indicates that the judges (who were Messrs. La Farge, Colman, and White) attached great importance to it. Otherwise than in decorativeness this is not especially interesting. There is not only no "Christmas" about it, but no idea of any sort beyond an agreeable combination of colors and objects of still-life excellently rendered. And this combination has a somewhat artificial and mechanical character, as if it were a study for some special interior decoration instead of a design simply to delight the eye. The gulf between it and the luckless exhibits is, however, vast. No. 63 is by no means a failure, and shows not a little skill and poetic feeling, but its mysticism is against it. There are free and flowing lines, and not a little vivacity of movement in the snowballing angels of No. 292, but for color it might as well be in black and white. A familiar artist's hand is occasionally seen, as in No. 665, but at very rare intervals. Mr. Sandier, who took the second prize a year ago, sends three, prettily executed but rather feebly conceived. No. 347 has a quaint look, as if the early Italian masters had impressed the artist a good deal, but its drawing would excite the censure of the most inexpert observer. No. 462 is a bit of ludicrously ambitious "impressionism" and a standing witness, *lucus a non lucendo*, that the success of practised impressionists is not haphazard. Indeed, the puerile execution of many of the designs is as noticeable as the frivolous or commonplace conception of most of them. In No. 495 we have a union of the two demerits—a marvellous portrait of General Garfield with pictorial illustration of the legend "From the log-cabin to the White House." There were, we believe, over 1,000 contributors, of whose drawings 1,500 were rejected and 700 accepted. Of course there is no means of knowing precisely what class of the community furnished the majority of these, but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there must be a large number of amateurs dabbles in what they had far better abandon for some department of effort in which it is possible for their work to be serious. Other obvious reflections concern the widespread æsthetic poverty which the exhibition testifies to, just as American self-gratulation upon its general æsthetic progress is becoming a little noisy; and the keen disappointment of many ardent and ambitious young people who have doubtless been spurred by family flatterers to an infinite amount of profitless industry. Some of the worst things here it must have taken months of patient labor to bring to their present state of hopeless imperfection.

—The numerous contributions of Mr. Samuel H. Scudder to the fossil insect fauna of North America, irrespective of their purely entomological merits, are of peculiar importance as bearing upon the subject of derivative structural development. There is, probably, no more competent authority in this special field of science than Mr. Scudder, and scientists in general may be congratulated on the fact that so important a branch of study has fallen into the hands of so distinguished a naturalist. The main conclusions respecting the oldest known insects—those of the Palæozoic era—are summed up in the current number of the *American Journal of Science* (February, 1881), and the general results arrived at may be briefly stated as follows: The general type of wing-structure has remained unaltered from the earliest times (*i.e.*, from the Middle Devonian, the formation in which the most ancient known insect remains occur) to the present day; the oldest (Devonian) forms represent mainly synthetic types of a comparatively narrow range, having but little special relation to the succeeding Carboniferous forms, and indicating, by a remarkable variety of structure in the limited number of obtained specimens, an extensive insect fauna of the period. None of these earliest forms are referable to later (known) types, either ancient or modern, and "some of them appear to be even more complicated than their nearest living allies"; "as far as either greater unity or simplicity of structure is concerned," we appear to be no nearer to a "beginning of things in the Devonian epoch than in the Carboniferous"; nor can these earlier forms be used to "better advantage than the Carboniferous types in support of any special theory of the origin of insects." Finally, "while there are some forms which, to some degree, bear out expectations based on the general derivative hypothesis of structural development, there are quite as many which are altogether unexpected, and cannot be explained by that theory without involving suppositions for which no facts can at present be adduced." Mr. Scudder argues that to explain on evolutionary principles the occurrence of two such dissociated entomological faunæ as characterize the Devonian and Carboniferous periods, we must look for the common ancestral or comprehensive types in the remote Silurian, or even pre-Silurian period, and expresses his conviction that some such types "did exist and should be sought."

—The production of a choral work by Handel, which has not been given before in this country, is the principal event of this season's performances of the New York Oratorio Society. Since the foundation of this society the "Messiah" has been performed once a year, "Judas Maccabæus" has been given once, some four years ago, but of a great number of works of equal beauty and grandeur little or nothing is known in America. "Israel in Egypt" has been considered by many the greatest of Handel's compositions,

yet not a single number of this immortal work, which offers no extraordinary difficulties, has ever been heard here. Dr. Damrosch's production of "L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, ed Il Moderato" was therefore hailed with joy by all admirers of the old master. The libretto is taken from Milton's well-known poems, which a well-meaning friend of Handel's, a Mr. Jennens, unfortunately undertook to improve by adding a third part, "Il Moderato," which is as superfluous as his poetry after Milton's stateliness is commonplace and even absurd. To those who have known Handel only from the solemn movements and majestic choruses of the "Messiah" he appears in an entirely new light in this composition, which contains a variety of descriptive airs and choruses so realistic in their expression that they would satisfy the most ardent disciple of Wagner. Most interesting in this respect are the first tenor aria, "Haste thee, nymph, and bring with thee," followed by the chorus, with peals of Homeric laughter on the words "And Laughter, holding both his sides"; and a beautiful duet between soprano and flute, "Sweet bird, that shunn'st the noise of folly," where the obligato flute part, imitating the song of the nightingale, produces a truly admirable effect. The aria "Oft on a plat of rising ground" is of great descriptive beauty. It is a solo for soprano with a most delicate, legato string accompaniment in pianissimo, the double basses, pizzicato, ringing out in fifths the "solemn curfew's sound"; and when the full chorus joins first in pianissimo, then swelling into a magnificent crescendo, an unsurpassable combination of beautiful harmonies and of striking vocal and instrumental effects is produced. We cannot, of course, analyze the forty-seven numbers of this elaborate composition. Dr. Damrosch has not once this year been entirely fortunate in the choice of his soloists. The two ladies who undertook the soprano parts were not equal to their task. Both are pretty well schooled and conscientious, but neither of the two possesses a fresh, full, and sympathetic voice. The two male parts were better. Mr. Henschel was in good voice and gave his principal number, "Populous cities please me then," with splendid spirit. Mr. Toedt is a young artist of decided promise. His tenor voice is not very powerful nor of great compass, but his manner is excellent, his intonation pure, his pronunciation clear, and his voice comes full and without effort from his chest. The chorus and orchestra were very satisfactory. The performance was the last of the Oratorio Society this season. Dr. Damrosch and his chorus will now devote their whole time to the practice of the extensive and ambitious programmes of the Musical Festival, which begins on the 2d of May.

—Mr. Max Strakosch opened on Monday night a short season of English opera at the Fifth Avenue Theatre. Not shunning comparison, he boldly selected Boito's "Mefistofele" for his first performance. The Mapleson troupe had all the advantages of orchestra, chorus, soloists, and *mise en scène*; Mr. Strakosch, nevertheless, made something more than a *succès d'estime*. Madame Marie Roze is the star of his company, and assumed the double part of *Margaret and Helen*. This artist always relies more on her fine dramatic powers and handsome stage appearance than on her vocal qualities. She sang her part on Monday with great effect, acted with passionate warmth, and looked, as Helen of Troy, truly charming. Mr. Conly, who has a beautiful voice but does not know how to manage it, was rather heavy as *Mefistofele*. Mr. Perugini is not a sympathetic tenor. Chorus and orchestra were only fair.

—When one reads in one of Milton's divorce pamphlets his declaration that he means not "to dispute philosophy with this pork who never read any," he ascribes its temper and taste to the well-known lack of amenity characteristic of seventeenth-century controversy. Readers of the English literary weeklies for some months past, however, must have been reminded that this is a superficial view. For some months the survival of Milton's polemical manner and method has here been copiously illustrated, and considering how long these have existed as models for those attracted by them it is singular that so little development is to be observed in the use of them. The conservatism manifested in clinging to the "pork" figure is in itself curious. Mr. Carlyle's employment of it was never wholly successful, perhaps, and although he used it in a general way, and in discussing "burning questions," its taste was very widely regarded as questionable. But to find it in strictly personal controversy between the New Shakspeare Society and its opponents, concerning purely literary questions, seems reactionary and argues meagreness of invention. The most recent victim of this pleasantry is Mr. J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, who, by way of protesting against it, publishes a recent correspondence between Mr. Browning and himself. Mr. Browning is the president of the Society in question, and it appears from the correspondence that Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps called his attention to a preface to a fac-simile of the second edition of *Hamlet* "conspicuously announced on the title-page as written by the 'Founder and Director of the New Shakspeare Society,'" in which he was referred to as "a leading member of the firm of Pigsbrook & Co.," and his Shakspearean criticism described as "porcine vagaries" promulgated "on the prongs of a dung-fork." He had, he said, previously written to the Committee of the Society about the matter, but they had pro-

tested lack of jurisdiction, and accordingly he asked Mr. Browning to "insist upon the Director's withdrawal of the above-quoted disreputable language." Mr. Browning, however, also played Pilate, and pleaded the purely honorary character of his office, but added that, if he should ever attend any of his Society's meetings, he would take pains to invoke the spirit of "gentle Shakspeare." Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps had then, of course, nothing left him to do but to write a scathing rejoinder. He pointed out to Mr. Browning that the Director's language was "a resuscitation of the coarseness of Swift without his humor," said some severe things about its vulgarity, and intimated plainly that he considered it "detrimental to the best interests of all concerned in the pursuit of Shakspearean studies." He also considered much of the critical work of the New Shakspeare Society equally detrimental to these interests, and denounced "the scandal of the plays of our national dramatist being allotted out into the unfit-nature group, the tempter-yielding group, the lust group, the cursing group, the false-love group"—all which, though the Society must have spent much time and pains in getting it up, he characterized as "miserable nonsense." He should never have noticed anything proceeding from such a source, he declares, but for its official connection. The Society, being a society, humbugs the public by having "the most wonderful list of vice-presidents ever seen outside the announcement of a cottage-garden flower-show." "Pigsbrook & Co.," it may be needless to mention, is a delicate allusion to Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps's agreement with Mr. Swinburne concerning the character of the New Shakspeare Society, and Mr. Furnivall, the director alluded to, would probably say that he had the latter chiefly in mind and endeavored to adapt his invective accordingly.

—Signor Corazzini has proposed in the *Preludio* a novel scheme for the organization of Italian libraries, based on the idea of the division of labor, or, in evolutionary phrase, the differentiation of functions. Books should be bought for the public libraries, he says, according to some general principle, and not, as now, "by chance or caprice"; and there should be one general library at Rome to embrace every branch of knowledge, while the libraries in the other Italian cities should confine themselves each to two or three branches, according to the character of their inhabitants: Turin, for example, to take the exact sciences, industry, and the military arts; Milan, hydraulics, linguistics, Celtic antiquities, and the ancient languages of Italy; Venice, the arts, commerce, and marine of the Middle Ages; Padua, Greek and Latin philology; Genoa, commerce and naval architecture; Bologna, the legislation of the Middle Ages; Florence, Italian language and literature, and modern fine arts; Pisa, natural history; Leghorn, modern nautical science and the history of navigation; Perugia, Etruscan antiquities; Rome, Roman antiquities; Naples, physics, astronomy, Greek antiquities, medicine, and music; Palermo, Phœnician and Moslem antiquities; and so on. The scheme is somewhat like that long pursued at Hamburg, where the libraries have divided knowledge among them and avoided wasting their resources in useless duplication, and at Boston, where a similar partition of work has been made. In these cases, however, each city still has within itself books on all subjects; in Signor Corazzini's plan, if it were strictly carried out, each city would have a very one-sided collection. But probably it is not intended that it should be pushed to an extreme, and if managed with good sense and moderation it seems to us practicable and economical. By compelling each library to concentrate its energies on a few objects, it is much more likely to lead to the formation of complete collections than the present haphazard method of accretion.

—In a former number of the *Nation* (October 17, 1878) we reviewed Ihne's 'Early Rome,' one of the series of "Epochs in Ancient History." About a year ago the author published a new volume (the fifth) of his 'Römische Geschichte,' a work which is not so well known in this country as it deserves, although the earlier volumes have been translated into English. It is, in a certain sense, a rival of Mommsen's, especially in the early period. Ihne's theories upon this period we discussed in our former article. He likewise differs from Mommsen in regard to the contest between Rome and Carthage, and here his book is especially serviceable as presenting what we may call the pro-Carthaginian view. The fifth volume embraces the period from the Gracchi to Sulla, as to which Ihne's view does not differ so materially from Mommsen's as in some of the earlier portions. He does not rate Gaius Gracchus so high, or Glaucia so low, and he does not represent the Sullan constitution as so pronouncedly aristocratic in its character. But his general estimate of the situation, the causes of the downfall of the republic, and the relation of parties and statesmen, is essentially the same as Mommsen's. The fourth volume, published in 1876, is noteworthy as being an attempt—the most systematic and elaborate with which we are acquainted—to present a concrete view of the workings of the Roman Government under the senatorial rule, from an historical rather than an antiquarian point of view. It contains sixteen chapters. The first six treat of the constitution of Rome, the next five of the finances and foreign policy, the next five of society and internal history. We believe that this volume has not yet been translated into English. When it is it will meet a want, in respect to our knowledge of the ancient Romans, which is real and serious. The translation, by the way,

is, we believe, made by Dr. Ihne himself, who lived for several years in England.

—The comparative philology of the languages of India, from the oldest Vedic dialect down through classical Sanskrit and Pali and the Prakrits to tongues now existing, is a vast, intricate, and most interesting subject, a whole science in itself. Hardly anywhere else within the limits of our family of languages have the original formations been so thoroughly overgrown and hidden, and replaced by what is new, and the details of the process will long continue to be matters for much difference of opinion. Within a few years past several important contributions to the study have been made public: Friedrich Müller's chapters in his account of the results of the *Norara* expedition; Beames's 'Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages'; our countryman Kellogg's 'Grammar of the Hindi Language'; and, finally, Professor Hoernle's 'Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian [Modern Indian] Languages' (London: Trübner, 1880). The last is a work of great learning and industry, and its Introduction offers original and interesting views as to the relations of the different languages and their connections with the Prakrits as defined and described by the old Sanskrit grammarians. Into the details there is no reason that we should enter here; but the work may be strongly recommended to the attention of all who are interested in its special themes, and to students of the history of language in general.

A CENTURY OF DISHONOR.*

MRS. JACKSON'S book is, as its title indicates, an arraignment of the official dealings of the Government with the Indians. Mr. Manypenny's book, which we noticed some months ago, was an arraignment of the Army in its action as the instrument of force by which the Government imposes its rule upon the uncivilized tribes. The two books are counterparts of each other, and fairly exhibit the views of intelligent and sympathetic writers whose standpoints are quite different. Mr. Manypenny had been Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and vindicated the general humanity and justice of the civil administration of the Government toward the Indians, tracing the woes of the tribes to the selfishness and hostility of the communities directly in contact with them, aggravated by the undistinguishing severity, and often cruelty, of the military in their methods of repression and punishment. Mrs. Jackson seems to have written her "sketch" under the impulse of a recent championship of the Poncas, in which she had entered into some controversy with the Secretary of the Interior regarding the proposed return to Dakota of the band now settled in the Indian Territory. She formed the opinion that the action of the Department in discouraging the new migration was unjust and arbitrary, and with a tacit application of the Scripture, "If these things are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" she hurries, as we think, to the conclusion that the great crime lies at the door of the successive administrations of the Government.

The situation of the Indian tribes beyond the boundaries of civilization has made them peculiarly subject to wrongs which might be committed with impunity. The agent who robs them, the Chivington who massacres them, the frontiersman who drives them from their reservations, are tempted to their crimes by the fact that investigation will be slow and difficult, if it can be made at all. The opportunity for secrecy in wrong-doing has been the prolific parent of crime since the first theft or murder was committed. The removal of the restraints of civilized public opinion reveals, with a rude shock, the weakness of human nature, and should teach humility by proving how few there are who come within the ancient definition of the philosopher—one who, if all laws were abrogated, would still live the same. But, apart from the crimes of individuals, there is still a responsibility for wrong which rests upon us as a civilized nation; wrong which we have done as a community against these weaker communities, and in which our armies, our Congresses, and our administrations have been only our agents. For the frauds and murders we should try to mete out appropriate punishment; but for the greater wrong, of which these are the almost insignificant concomitants—the policy of generations of civilized men toward the savages—the nation as a whole must be held accountable and each must bear his share.

The warmest sympathizer with the Indian's wrongs will repudiate the opinion that civilization should have remained in Europe and scrupulously respected the right of the red man to the possession of this continent. Our author recognizes the "theory of some sentimentalists that the Indians were the real owners of the soil" as an untenable extreme. European colonization was, therefore, right in her opinion. But just here's the rub. European colonization meant the occupation of the continent by the teeming millions of to-day as certainly in 1620 as now. It needed no prophecy to foresee the result, and to know that even Penn's purchase and his pacific policy were only a temporary makeshift. As the swarming hives of the earlier settlements an-

nually moved westward the need of more room was sure to be felt. The problem has never been other than this one, Shall the weaker race be civilized and absorbed or shall it be exterminated? Let us confess it, the real policy of all civilized communities in the face of this problem has been the same: the people of the United States share it with the Englishman in New Zealand and the Dutch Boer in South Africa. We have tacitly accepted the theory of extermination, while we have made public profession of the desire to protect and improve the races which were not readily assimilated or which refused the rôle of a servile class.

The hypocrisy of this is not always conscious, but that will not support a plea of innocence; for the shirking of a self-examination which would force our guilt upon us is a half-confession. Let us no longer shoulder off the crime upon officers of the Government to whom we have appointed the impossible task of occupying the whole continent with our white race without hurting the red tribes. The philanthropist who would gain the right to rebuke must show a remedy, and of remedies there has been a plentiful lack—a thing by no means uncommon among theorists. Mrs. Jackson gives us no more light than her predecessors on this crucial point. Mr. Schurz has reached the conclusion that the rapid and irresistible spread of settlements in the interior of the continent, the building of Pacific railways, and the consequent disappearance of the buffalo and wild horse with all the larger game, have brought us to a point where, willy-nilly, the subsistence of the Indian tribes by the chase is practically ended. Consequently they must either be supported in idleness, with the inevitable results of idleness—viz., drunkenness and disease—or they must be taught agriculture, herding, and other modes of civilized life. But isolated tribes are protected with more difficulty than aggregated ones, and hence a return to what was the only serious effort at the solution of the problem in the last generation—the collection of the tribes in as few localities as may be, and the thorough test of their capacity to learn self-support. To meet the constant diminishing of reservations under the covetous demands of neighboring settlers, the Secretary has accepted the necessity of the subdivision of lands and the holding in severalty, under restrictions as to alienation. Here at least is a plan. Has any one proposed a better? Good friends of the Indian have doubted the desirability of segregating the lands and breaking up the tribal tie, but is there any help for it? Great railway claims for alternate sections through and across nearly all reservations are only in abeyance—sleeping, not dead. A new discovery of mines makes a new rush of miners, and we have had but one result: collisions, outbreaks, Indian war, treaty, with cession of the invaded territory, follow with painful and never-varying iteration. Distributing the 'Century of Dishonor' by colporteurs in every cabin on the frontier will not prevent it. The Secretary seems to us to have a claim upon right-minded people to be allowed to try his plan fairly, as being the result of admitted ability and honesty applied to a question which he has had the best means of studying.

Because we look at the question in this way, we regret that the very interesting and valuable book Mrs. Jackson has given us should be an obstacle to the fair trial of Mr. Schurz's plan. Its influence will work towards disunion among philanthropic people when there ought to be the utmost solidarity of effort. It impugns the justice of an officer who has the confidence of honest people so far that they will say, If he is not just in his administration of Indian affairs, who will be? It has occurred to us, and we think it ought to occur to others who study this matter, that a Government officer may not be able to state publicly all the reasons which influence him, and may fairly trust to our intelligence to see some that he may not care to dwell upon. In the case of the Poncas, they were hardly treated in their transfer from Dakota to the Indian Territory; but they have weathered the change of climate, are content, and their future promises well. This alone would be some reason for avoiding a fresh change—perhaps enough, though certainly not all that is to be considered in favor of their remaining where they are. The Indian Territory is the fortress within which a hopeful defence may be made against further aggression upon the reservations. It has been now solemnly dedicated to Indian use, has been longer respected, has withstood stronger attacks, the title to the land itself is legally in better shape—in short, in everything which makes the chance of carrying out a policy of civilization, it is much better off than any other Territory or reservation. A tribe which has become acclimated and contented there has ten chances of surviving where it would have one in Nebraska or Dakota. Whatever may have been the wrong involved in the original transfer of the Poncas, practical philanthropy demands that we should not try to stir up dissatisfaction and force their return, when the result would be probably disastrous. The exact circumstances which surrounded them before their migration could not be reproduced; and one familiar with the conditions of things in the rapidly-changing country of the Upper Missouri can easily see that they would indeed be flying to evils that they know not of.

But we do not mean to discuss the details of the Ponca case. The one thing which we think the occasion demands is that all who wish the "century of dishonor" to be followed by a better day should fix in their minds this fact—that the Indian Territory is the ground upon which they can best defend the

* 'A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Government's Dealings with some of the Indian Tribes.' By H. H., Author of 'Verses,' 'Bits of Travel,' etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881.

remaining rights of the aboriginal population. A similar aggregation of tribes may be hopefully made among the Sioux, but the recognized vested rights of the Indians in the Indian Territory proper give standing-ground to resist aggression, such as is found nowhere else. There a semi-civilization already exists; there the necessary experiment of subdivision of tribal lands can be most safely made; there the friends of Indian improvement can most easily watch and guard the rights and interests of the little and weak communities. Whilst these reasons may not be sufficient to warrant any coercion, or even urgency, upon other tribes to migrate there, they seem to us abundant for most carefully avoiding any disturbance of those who are even moderately content and prosperous in the homes there allotted to them.

MYERS'S WORDSWORTH.*

IN less than two hundred pages Mr. Myers has here stated the case for Wordsworth with great ability and a temper that cannot well be overpraised. Wordsworth has recently been made the subject of much discussion, and though the many excellent critics who have engaged in it have been, in one sense or another, Wordsworthians, nearly all of it has had more or less the air of controversy. Controversy about Wordsworth is tempting, and for a long time to come his poetry will remain a centre of controversy, not because it is difficult to know or appreciate, but because it appeals strongly to some people and very slightly if at all to others. To an extent it is true of every product of the imagination, that its popularity depends upon the original bent of the mind that judges it, but of poetry, and particularly of Wordsworth's poetry, it is true in a far greater degree. Mr. Arnold, for example, who has an instinctive dislike to mysticism of any kind, either in poetry or the criticism of poetry, nevertheless finds an inspiring sublimity in Wordsworth's

"And never lifted up a single stone";

and, on the other hand, it is entirely open to the critic who believes with Milton that poetry should be "impassioned and sensuous," as well as "simple," to say that the line is rhythmic prose. Clearly, discussion is as futile when we come upon a fundamental difference of this sort as it is seductive when one is thinking of the thousand things to be said in favor of one's own view, and also of the thousand things adverse to this and plainly resulting from misconceptions that are current. The service done by Mr. Arnold's essay is not to be underestimated by those who hold Wordsworth's fame dear; for, aside from clearing away the stumbling-blocks zealously laid by many of the poet's admirers in the path of the student of his poetry, it was an appeal, and an admirable appeal, to the reader impatient with Wordsworth to revise his standards and examine more closely into the nature of poetry of the highest sort. For constructive criticism of this kind we do not know that Mr. Myers has any turn, but whether he has or not, Mr. Arnold's essay left an advocate of Wordsworth very little to say in this way, and it is a sure proof of Mr. Myers's tact that he has addressed himself solely to the exposition of his subject. Moreover, he has not only taken this general line, but he has scrupulously avoided any swerving to this side or that to share in the current Wordsworth controversy, either to elaborate a neglected, or to confute an ill-taken, point. There is nothing anywhere in the book to indicate that he has so much as heard of this discussion. Obviously such a course has positive advantages as well as the negative one of avoiding incumbrances and distracting digressions. It not only secures the opportunity for developing simply and rationally the conception which the author entertains of his subject, but it tends strongly to produce such a development. Accordingly we have in Mr. Myers's book a biography which is consistent and complete, so far as it goes. Add to this excellence of form a marked felicity of style, clear, graceful, and in general wholly unrhettorical, and matter corresponding naturally, in reserve and the equipoise of self-reliance, to the diction, and it is easy to see that Mr. Myers's contribution is one of the very best that have been made to Mr. Morley's series.

No part of the poet's life was richer in inspiration than his early years, he begins by saying. He derived his impressions not from books or companions, but even then at the outset from "Nature, his life-long mistress, loved with the first heats of youth." He began as he ended, and his ardent affection for Nature is rightly made the thread of the biography. At Cambridge he showed "an independence that seemed only rusticity, and an indolent ignorance which assumed too readily the tones of scorn"; and even had the intellectual life of the place been more active than it was, he would scarcely have sympathized with it. "Love for Nature was only slowly leading him to love and reverence for man," whom, indeed, it is acknowledged that to the end he "depicted as set, as it were, amid impersonal influences, which make his passion and struggle but a little thing." When he went to live in London he always regarded the whirl and movement of human life there externally, and never made the attempt, as Mr. Myers puts it, "to enter that realm of emo-

tion where Nature's aspects become the scarcely noted accessory of vicissitudes that transcend her own." Nature consoled him for his temporary loss of faith in her as well as in other things when the Reign of Terror succeeded the Revolution he had greeted so heartily; he went into the country and settled at Grasmere and reconquered his early affections. Mr. Myers's chapters on "The English Lakes," "Marriage—Society—Highland Tour," "Sir George Beaumont," "Death of John Wordsworth," "'Happy Warrior' and Patriotic Poems," "Children—Life at Rydal Mount—'The Excursion,'" and "Poetic Diction—'Laodamia'—'Evening Ode,'" bring us up to his consideration of Wordsworth's "natural religion," which is perhaps the happiest chapter in the book. The title itself is happy, and suggests what follows. His discussion of Wordsworth's "poetic diction" is admirable, and one is disposed to linger over such passages as: "For some twenty years at most (1798-1818) Wordsworth possessed this gift of melody. During those years he wrote works which profoundly influenced mankind. The gift then left him; he continued as wise and as earnest as ever, but his poems had no longer any potency, nor his existence much public importance." But it is in the chapter on "Natural Religion" that the writer's view of his subject's message to mankind is expressly stated, and stated from the point of view of sympathetic interpretation, in a perfect manner. As he says, Wordsworth's exponents are not content to treat his poems on nature simply as graceful descriptive pieces, but "speak of him in terms usually reserved for the originators of some great religious movement." Why, he asks, could Wordsworth "affect a critic like De Quincey—I do not say with admiration, but with this exceptional sense of revelation and awe"—and at the same time seem puerile to the reviews of the day? Of course, one answer to this is that it was because the reviews of the day and De Quincey were what they were—thralls, the one of convention and the other of whim. But Mr. Myers would accept this explanation no more than the rest of the Wordsworthians, and in his answer he has very acutely contrived to fuse the varied admiration of both wings, as they may be called, of the poet's admirers. Everybody accepts the assertion that Wordsworth did much to originate a great poetical movement, but to "define with exactness the new element imported by our poet into man's view of nature" is, of course, what is required. Mr. Myers discusses the view taken by Homer, the Hebrew poets, Lucretius, Virgil; then, after the Middle Age interregnum, by Chaucer; and finally, after the eighteenth-century artificiality, by Collins, Beattie, Thomson, Crabbe, Cowper, Burns, and Scott; and there is so much that is just in his review that we do not feel like suggesting that it is here and there strained a little to fit his purpose. Wordsworth differs from all his forerunners in adding nature to the list of stimuli which "may so exalt the inward faculties as to make a man *ἐνθεὸς καὶ ἑκφρων*—'bereft of reason, but filled with divinity'—perceptant of an intelligence other and larger than his own." His worship of Nature was neither pagan nor pantheistic, however; he "revived in a higher and purer form those primitive elements of reverence for nature's powers which had diffused themselves into speculation, or crystallized into mythology. . . . Thus much, I think, may be fairly said, that the maxims of Wordsworth's form of natural religion were uttered before Wordsworth only in the sense in which the maxims of Christianity were uttered before Christ." Again: "In all these passages, it will be observed, the emotion is educed from Nature rather than added to her; she is treated as a mystic text to be deciphered, rather than as a stimulus to roving imagination." After this Mr. Myers returns to the story of the poet's later years, "if that can be called a story which derives no interest from incident or passion, and dwells only on the slow broodings of a meditative soul."

We have endeavored to indicate the character of his book, and it seems clear that from the utter absence of the controversial spirit, the grace of style and sobriety of matter, and the sympathetic interpretation which characterize it, its effect cannot fail of being in a noteworthy degree persuasive. Its dignity and simplicity are distinctly persuasive, and will do far more towards softening the hard hearts of the anti-Wordsworthians than a work couched in the usual Wordsworthian tone could. And yet, as we have said, it is the case for Wordsworth that Mr. Myers has here presented, and he is none the less an advocate for having presented it deftly and persuasively. One lays down his book with a renewed sense of Wordsworth's greatness, so simply are its claims set forth and so skilfully are they justified. But on reflection any one not a Wordsworthian will feel that Mr. Myers's tact rather than the soundness of his case is to be credited with this result, that he is dispassionate rather than disinterested, and that he has left many things for the advocate on the other side to say before a judicial decision is to be obtained. This portrait of the man suggests none of the shortcomings that indisputably belong there. It is drawn very candidly so far as it is drawn, but a page of Emerson's account of his visit to Rydal Mount gives one a far more vivid sense of Wordsworth's limitations. From Mr. Myers's characterization one can readily understand how natural it was for Wordsworth to make his memorable and acute judgment of Goethe's poetry—that it was not inevitable enough; but to understand the reason of his fatal disparagement of Goethe in general (of which, as of many like infelicities, Mr. Myers tells us nothing),

* "Wordsworth. By F. W. H. Myers." [English Men of Letters.] New York: Harper & Brothers, 1881.

we have to recall Arnold's admission that he "did not know enough" and disparaged Goethe without reading him. Fatally limited, in just the directions in which the modern world that began with him insists upon capacity, Wordsworth unquestionably was. The poets who were his contemporaries and peers—Byron, Shelley, Keats—also doubtless "did not know enough," but either they touched the world at more points of sympathy or their instinct supplied their deficiency in knowledge. Wherein Wordsworth excels them has been too often and too recently stated to need any reference here, but even his moral soundness and spiritual purity are for all but Wordsworthians unsatisfactorily alloyed by just that quality which Mr. Myers so felicitously defines in saying that he treats nature "as a mystic text to be deciphered, rather than as a stimulus to roving imagination." To the modern world his interpretations of this mystic text are valuable mainly, we suspect, for their imaginative force. In fine, as a man he led too narrow a life, and as a poet, when he soared beyond "the joy offered to us in nature, the joy offered to us in the simple elementary affections and duties," he often pursued his theme too fancifully, with too confident a gnosticism—if we may use such an expression—to be felt by the modern world to be at the true centre of the situation. His material may not "crystallize into mythology," but it certainly "diffuses into speculation." Mr. Myers has, perhaps, done wisely in making no reference to the prose note which lies so near at hand in all but a few of his works that it not only comes to the surface in the same poems with his highest poetry, but often seems impending at the next line of a stanza. That is an acknowledged difficulty for which there are acknowledged compensations, adequate or not as one chooses. But he might have given us a picture of which the shadows should appear more clearly. Certainly he would not deny Wordsworth's ability to stand a far more searching ordeal than that to which he has subjected him; and we, at least, do not doubt Mr. Myers's power to be in such an attempt as permanently convincing as he is here persuasive.

HOW TO UNDERSTAND MUSIC.*

MR. MATHEWS'S book may be regarded as a sort of musical vade-mecum, and is in some respects unlike any book now before the public. It is an attempt to apply the system of object-lessons to musical education, and is, as such, no less valuable to teachers than to pupils. In the first chapters the elementary musical terms, such as phrase, period, cadence, modulation, counterpoint, variations, etc., are defined and explained. Succeeding chapters discuss musical form—as, e.g., the sonata and its construction—or what might be called the anatomy of music. These are followed by studies in the content of music—the intellectual and the emotional, the sensuous and the idealized, descriptive and suggestive music. Parts fifth and sixth consist of studies in classical and in romantic music, while part seventh describes the various forms of song, including the opera and oratorio. In all these chapters the author has with good discrimination and evidence of wide experience chosen from the works of composers, great and small, characteristic pieces which the teacher is supposed to play or sing as illustrations of the explanations given in the book. Part ninth contains short sketches of the principal composers. Very valuable and alone worth the price of the book is an appendix of eighty pages, constituting a condensed musical encyclopædia such as every musician must often wish he had lying within arm's-reach on his instrument or table. By a judicious avoidance of all superfluous words and facts the author has managed to condense into this small compass a vast amount of information, chiefly borrowed, with due acknowledgment, from Mendel's 'Musikalisches Conversations-Lexikon' and Grove's 'Dictionary of Music and Musicians.'

Apparently for the benefit of those readers who like to skip, a chapter has been introduced on the nature and meaning of the beautiful. It consists, mainly, of a synopsis of some of Ruskin's eccentric speculations on the subject, which, with all their interesting details and brilliant style, are of little systematic or philosophical value. We fail to see what is gained by discussing the attributes of beauty under such heads as "Purity, the type of Divine Energy"; "Infinity, the type of Divine Incomprehensibility"; "Symmetry, the type of Divine Justice," and so on. Such classifications and speculations were quite in order in the days of scholasticism, a couple of centuries ago, but they happen to be out of date at present. The same objection applies to some of the following chapters, in which Hegel's views on the different arts are ventilated. The trouble with Hegel's æsthetic speculations is the same as with all his other speculations. He is always, as Beneke would say, trying to build a house by beginning at the roof. Hegel's explanations seldom throw light enough to make their own darkness visible, and if the author cares for our advice he will omit this part of his book in a future edition. None of the treatises on musical æsthetics now extant add much to the understanding of their art, and the reason is that, as in philosophy in general, the writers have hitherto usually begun at the wrong end. The only way to

change æsthetics from a mass of obscure phrases into a science is to follow the example of the natural sciences and begin at the beginning. The sciences to which æsthetics must apply for its principal facts are zoölogy, anthropology, and physiological acoustics. Zoölogy yields, among other interesting problems, that of sexual selection, or the question how far the æsthetic sense must be supposed to be developed in the lower animals. Anthropology supplies a large number of suggestive facts as to the origin of the arts of dancing, sculpture, painting, and song among savages, which in course of time will take the place of the Greek myths about Mercury and the musical tortoise-shell which now grace the introductory chapters of most histories of music. Finally, through the work of Helmholtz in physiological acoustics a vast field has been opened for future research, a field of which Helmholtz himself remarks that the most interesting part remains to be explored. When once, with the aid of these sciences, a secure basis for æsthetics has been secured, it will be time enough to see whether the roof which the metaphysicians so kindly prepared beforehand out of cerebral cobwebs will fit on the new structure. By that time it will probably be found too light and too full of holes to be of any use.

It is a pleasure to turn from these chapters to the interesting sketches of famous composers which follow. They are cleverly done, containing, besides a brief account of the life and work of each artist, a just estimate of his position in the world of art. The composers selected are Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Chopin, Liszt, and Wagner, the others being more briefly discussed in the appendix. It is not stated on what principle this selection is made, but if the aim was to describe those only, and all those, who have exercised an important influence on some branch of the musical art, the name of Schubert, at least, should have been added. Lyric song is the most accessible and widely prevalent form of music, since it needs for performance no expensive orchestra, stage, and chorus, like symphony, opera, and oratorio. The genius pre-eminent in this sphere must accordingly rank with the very highest, and Schubert's songs are as immeasurably superior in every respect to all other songs written before or after him as Chopin's compositions for the pianoforte are to all others ever written for that instrument. On the other hand, Mendelssohn's claim to stand in the front row will be denied by many at the present day. He was one of those artists who rose into sudden great popularity, and experience has shown again and again that those are seldom the longest-lived artists. Our music-dealers record a great decrease in the sale of his compositions, and it must now be the aim of all lovers of good music to prevent his name from falling into a neglect as excessive and injudicious as the over-estimation in which it was formerly held.

In regard to Liszt, Mr. Mathews says that "his influence in art will be very great, but as a composer it will probably be limited to the present generation." To us it seems that Liszt's compositions have been as yet far too seldom heard to risk such an opinion about them. It is hardly fair to mark them especially as the type of the "sensational." Liszt does not, as a rule, aim at an effect for its own sake, or to tickle the popular ear, as Meyerbeer habitually does, but to give utterance to some striking idea. What sounds to our Aryan ears wild, fragmentary, and sensational, and makes Liszt's compositions so thoroughly *sui generis*, is largely due to his Hungarian nationality, and is a characteristic of all Magyar music. By creating the "Rhapsodie Hongroise" and the "Symphonic Poem" Liszt has also exercised an influence on musical form which will be felt by future generations. We must also take exception to one or two of the criticisms on Wagner, although otherwise we are quite in accord with the opinions expressed about him. The author insists that "music is the language of love, and of serious and noble affection"; that it can and may express grief, but never hate; that, accordingly, the scene between *Ortrud* and *Frederick* in the second act of "*Lohengrin*" is an ungrateful strain on the attention, because it can but excite a "hellish fascination," and "it is questionable whether such a scene has any business with music at all." With pure instrumental music, intended for the concert stage, perhaps not. But it is the prerogative of dramatic music to express all the emotions of the soul, those of hatred as well as those of love. A drama with only good and lovable characters would be but a dreary entertainment. Through Beethoven, Chopin, and especially Wagner, the scale of emotions that can be expressed by musical instruments has been largely extended, and one of the reasons why Mozart and Haydn no longer give us the thorough satisfaction they gave our ancestors is because their range of emotions is so limited. The scene in "*Lohengrin*" just referred to is regarded as one of the finest, if not the finest, scene in the opera by those who have seen it as impersonated by Frau Materna in Vienna or Fräulein Brandt in Berlin. It fore-shadows, more than anything else in the opera, the dramatic perfection reached in "*Siegfried*" and "*Tristan und Isolde*." With an incompetent *Ortrud* and a generally wretched performance, such as we usually have here, this scene is indeed dreary beyond belief; but that is not Wagner's fault. We must also object to the statement that "nothing is more conspicuous in Wagner than his lack of wit and humor." This assertion is partly unjust and partly incorrect. Unjust, because Wagner's sympathies, as shown by the

* How to Understand Music: A Concise Course in Musical Intelligence and Taste. By W. S. M. Mathews. Chicago: Donnelly, Gassette & Loyd. 1880.

choice of his subjects and his admiration for Schopenhauer, are mainly with sad and tragic aspects of life; incorrect, because in the two cases where he has entered the comic field he has shown himself very successful. Wagner's humor, like Beethoven's, is tinged with sadness; but that is the case with all the best humor. Playfulness and a bright pleasantry pervade the scenes between *Mime* and *Siegfried* in the first act of "*Siegfried*," while all the other forms of humor—sarcasm, wit, parody—are cleverly employed in "*Die Meistersinger*." *Beckmesser* in this opera is the most thoroughly comical figure on the operatic stage. Some prominent critics on the Continent say it is not, but they are always refuted by the laughter of the audience.

Anecdotes of Public Men. By John W. Forney. Vol. ii. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1881.)—This medley includes chapters on deadheads, on Forney's *Press*, on Mme. Tussaud's wax-works, on the French Exposition of 1867 and the Centennial, on Philadelphia Clubs, on "German, Irish, and Yankee Patois in Poetry contrasted (!) with American Melody"; ranges from "Jim" Nye and Parson Brownlow to Dr. Samuel Johnson and Robert Burton; gives the whole of Lincoln's Gettysburg speech with long extracts from Everett's, specimens of Thomas Francis Meagher's "eloquence," the story of the fall of Louis Philippe and of the *Coup d'état*, part of Cartwright's eulogy on Jackson, fragments of the Kansas-Nebraska Debate, and, in fact, is devoid of all proportion, unity, or consecutiveness. In so far as it justifies its title at all it is a sort of bastard biographical dictionary, of an accuracy shown in calling Harrison Gray Otis a Revolutionary orator (he was born in 1765), and of a juiciness of which the two following extracts are fair samples:

"But I cannot tell you, in this hurried sketch, of the many happy hours I have spent with Blake (who died, aged fifty-eight, in April, 1863), Jefferson, Barney Williams, Murdoch, Wheatley, Conner, Fredericks, and Davenport, or of the great parts they have played. I can only tell you that Jefferson was born in Philadelphia, February 20, 1829; Williams, in Cork, Ireland, in 1823; Conner," etc., etc. (p. 90).

"Amos Kendall . . . knew Henry Clay, Richard M. Johnson, John J. Crittenden, Robert J. Breckinridge, of Kentucky. . . . In his official and editorial situations he knew Van Buren, Benton, Grundy, Silas Wright, . . . together with Livingston, General Scott, General Macomb, Commodores Stewart and Stockton, . . . He knew the great financiers of the country—bank presidents, bank directors, and capitalists; . . . He knew the old contractors before the age of railroads and steamboats; . . . As Postmaster-General and editor of the *Globe* and the *Expositor* he knew most of the journalists of all the States—Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire; James Gordon Bennett, James Watson Webb, . . . and, of course, the writers of Pennsylvania and Washington City—John Binns," etc., etc., etc. (p. 151).

"The immense success of the first volume" emboldened Colonel Forney to prepare what he calls "the new series." This word is ominous of what we may expect if his life is spared and his disposition does not grow sour. We said last October, after the election, that Colonel Forney's case was not a hard one because of his unflinching cheerfulness under reverses. In the preface to the present volume he finds "all our people are looking forward to a new era of production and prosperity," while he himself is hoping from General Garfield all that he expected from General Hancock's elevation to the Presidency. His motive for supporting the Democratic candidate was, he says, "sincere devotion to the conciliation of the sections," and not, as his "dear old friend" Daniel Dougherty probably recalls it, "the unspeakable ingratitude of the age" in Grant's rejection at Chicago, and the prospect of delivering Pennsylvania "from the terrible curse that has polluted its fair fame, destroyed the hope of its young men, and enriched its insolent politicians." He prides himself on the fact that his book, published on the heels of an exciting political campaign, contains not a page inconsistent with his "earnest desire to do justice to the motives of all men, of whatever rank, religion, party, or country," and is pervaded by "the same kindly spirit to the living and the dead" that characterized the preceding volume.

Having ourselves an equally earnest desire to do justice to Colonel Forney's amiability, we call his attention to the apparent unkindliness towards a distinguished living Pennsylvania statesman of the following passage, on p. 93 of his "*Anecdotes*," for which, no doubt, the proof-reader is altogether responsible:

"I have not shown, in a single instance, and I cannot think I shall show, even to my nearest friend, a letter written against him to me, because I consider it a breach of confidence." These were the words of James Buchanan, June 12, 1839, in reply to Simon Cameron, when the latter, as one of three commissioners appointed by President Van Buren, July 21, 1838, to examine into the claims of the half-breed relatives of the Winnebago Indians, being arraigned by Major Ethan Allen Hitchcock, United States Army, Military Disbursing Agent at St. Louis, on certain grave charges of malpractice in office, called upon Mr. Buchanan for the contents of a letter of the aforesaid Major Hitchcock, then, and up to the hour of his death, one of the bravest and truest men in the service of his country."

Was it not rather Simon Cameron who thus made reply to James Buchanan, a commissioner appointed by President Hitchcock, and charged by Major Van

Buren, etc., etc.? We only know that the Colonel's charity sufficeth for all things, and that only some such typographical substitutions would purge the above extract of malevolence. Moreover, the entire chapter seems to have been sophisticated, for the Colonel, after telling how he lately burnt a batch of old letters, though they contained little that would not bear printing, because "they were 'private,' and therefore sacred," is made to appear inconsistent by reprinting at full length the sacred letter of Horace Greeley dissolving "the political firm of Seward, Weed, and Greeley," which Mr. Raymond first gave to the world in 1860.

Causeries Florentines. Par Julian Klaczko. (Paris: Plon & Cie.; New York: F. W. Christern. 1880.)—As these *causeries* originally appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, it was, perhaps, in the hope of giving them a vivacious form that our author hampered himself with a number of persons to whom we are immediately introduced, supposed to be staying in a villa near Florence, who discuss Michael Angelo and Dante. The book is so full of interesting matter, and Julian Klaczko is so brilliant a writer, that we rather resent the mixed company whose opinions on matters of feeling and art are intended to be characteristic of their respective nationalities. Moreover, we continually find ourselves turning back to see whether the Pole or the French diplomatist or the Italian savant is speaking, while the strong personality of their inventor is predominant always.

The first conversation treats of Dante and of the "Divine Comedy," but more at length of Michael Angelo, the circumstances of his life, and the inspiration of his work. His name in all art history, in the words of our author, "exercises on our mind the same agonizing fascination" as that of Dante, and "recalls a whole world of equally great and mysterious suffering."

"Michael Angelo, the stern disciple of Savonarola and Dante, became early a familiar of the Vatican at a period of universal relaxation, at a period at which the warrior-like hardness of Julius II. was followed by the voluptuous pleasures of Leo X. An ardent republican, his soul full of dreams of the ancient grandeur and liberty of Florence, he became the protégé and the obligé of the Medicis, the oppressors of his country. What endless anomalies, how implacable the irony of fate seems in this artist's great career! He knew—he used to proclaim it on every occasion—that painting was not his domain; that he only felt a master and at his ease chisel in hand. It required all the despotic will of Julius II., all the imperious firmness of Paul III., to put the paint-brush in hands desiring only to model the marble. It was, however, given to Buonarroti to leave us finished and complete work only in his frescoes, while he never succeeded in finishing either the mausoleum of St. Lorenzo or the funeral monument of Pope Julius, which, in his old age, he used to call the great tragedy of his life."

Klaczko goes on to define the inward source of inspiration of the great Florentine's work, so dissimilar from antique art, and still more dissimilar to any work of his own time. That he understood Greek art, and loved it, is sufficiently shown in his "Love," taken by connoisseurs in Rome for an antique, and by his restorations of ancient statues—viz.: the Dancing Faun at Florence, the Dying Gladiator of the Capitol, and the River of the Vatican. He borrowed only the principle of the nude from Greek art; the serenity of thought and harmony of expression which are its very soul never inspired Michael Angelo in any of his creations. The plastic beauty of Greek art and the mystic grace of Christianity were alike indifferent to him to the very end. He seems to have been haunted by an ideal quite unknown to humanity, outside all art then known; as far from the classic as from the Christian tradition. Even the Pietà in St. Peter's was much commented on by his contemporaries, because its artist had so entirely deviated in this composition from the beaten track for religious subjects. This tendency accentuated itself with age. No artist has ever so entirely and violently broken with the hieratic traditions of his art, the historical development of which is the outgrowth of the belief and imagination of nations for centuries. The Sistine Chapel is a striking example of this. Julius II. wished to have the twelve apostles painted there, and they would have harmonized with the frescoes which were already painted on its walls. Michael Angelo, instead of these, substituted his incomparable Prophets and Sibyls. He was the first to inspire himself with Old Testament subjects—Moses, David, Jeremiah, Jonas, the Deluge, the Death of Goliath. His *arbitrariness* (according to Klaczko—we should call it his strong individuality) changed the very type of Christ in his "Last Judgment" among wingless angels and nimbus-lacking saints. Here also we find a hell without fire, and the bodies of the damned without their conventional circles of flame. In his "Defeat of the Pisans" Michael Angelo found only a pretext for displaying the human figure in action, soldiers bathing in a river disturbed by the sudden call of the clarion; no representation of actual persons or arms of the republic; all ideal, to the very landscape. The statues of the Duke of Nemours and the Duke of Urbino, in the Medicean chapel, are still more pointed illustrations of this. The memory of these nobles was still alive among their contemporaries, yet Michael Angelo attempted no likeness in their effigies, and excused himself by saying that no one could judge of the resemblance in the lapse of a thousand years.

The first evening ends in indicating the difference between the genius of Michael Angelo and that of Dante. The second *causerie* is devoted to the 'Vita Nuova,' and calls forth many trivial remarks from the persons supposed to be discussing this subject, as they seem to regard Dante and his love-story from an essentially fashionable and nineteenth-century point of view. They are shocked by what they term the "cold allegory" and forced symbolism which pervade the whole. The fanciful conceit of Beatrice being "a nine—i.e., a miracle whose root is no other than the Holy Trinity"—finds no excuse in "the mystic tendency of the age" even. They end in calling her an "erotic entity" without any personality—similar to Petrarch's Laura and the "donna gentili" of all the Italian sonnetists. The Academician, taking the leading part in this evening in a somewhat pompous manner, shows how the Italian love-poets were, in the character of their art, descendants of the troubadours and Provençal poets, and followed their plan of choosing a lady and discreetly avoiding any allusions disclosing her identity. He sees in the 'Vita Nuova' a rhetorical work, and disserts at length on Petrarch, Tasso, and the troubadours till he comes to Shakspeare's "Romeo and Juliet," in which he recognizes "the last note of the expiring *canso* and the first passionate cry of our modern drama." The sonnets and *canzons* of the 'Vita Nuova' were, he thinks, a work of early youth, and Beatrice, in the words of Dante, "had issued from the vulgar herd for thee" ('Inf.' ii.). She becomes in the poet's later work the symbol of ideal love. Therefore, in order to bring fresh symbols into his juvenile work, he wrote the prose portions of the 'Vita Nuova,' its final passage being the argument and prelude of the 'Divine Comedy.'

The third evening treats of the religious and Catholic tendency of the 'Divine Comedy.' The subject is too complicated to be discussed here. Very subtle reasoning is brought to show how mistakenly the school of Ugo Foscolo and of Gabriel Rossetti has represented Dante as the chief of a Masonic brotherhood working in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries at the destruction of Catholicism. A résumé of Karl Witte's hypothesis also comes before us. Our author disagrees with him on several points, and proves by numerous quotations how the sin of "infinite doubt" and "unlimited investigation is lacking alike in the science of the poet and in the conscience of his contemporaries." The last evening shows the political side of the 'Divine Comedy,' intended by the great poet for a moral and political exhortation to his contemporaries, as expressed by himself in his dedicatory letter to Can Grande della Scala: "One may briefly say that the object of this poem, as a whole, as in its different parts, is to tear those *living this life* from a state of misery and to lead them to a state of felicity."

The book is well worth reading; it is full of suggestions which awaken new thoughts and arguments on well-worn themes.

Rise of the Macedonian Empire. By Arthur M. Curteis, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and late Assistant-Master in Sherborne School. With maps. Pp. 224. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880.)—One hardly cares to speak of the "rise" of an empire or an institution unless it has had some continuous life after its establishment. An empire like the Macedonian, which had no career, but which went to pieces as soon as it had risen, had better be described in its entirety. Mr. Curteis's volume gives us not the rise merely, but the history of this empire, so far as its history is worth anything to us; and a few pages devoted to the tangled events that succeeded Alexander's death would have brought the reader to the battle of Ipsus, which was really the end of this empire. We would not, however, be captious as to the title; the book itself is a welcome addition to the series of "Epochs of Ancient History," and is a good and satisfactory history of a very important period. Covering, as it does, the whole career of Demosthenes, it will be a serviceable aid in the study of his orations. In this view it would have been well to make more of a point of showing clearly the relation of each of these speeches to the history. Nothing is of more importance than this, which is done adequately for the Olynthiads, but not for all the others, and even for the Olynthiads we note a fault which is common in the book—the lack of a plain chronology. There is nothing to show in what year these speeches were delivered, and the date of the capture and destruction of Olynthos is only to be found in the chronological table at the end of the book. Undoubtedly the most difficult portion of the work, and perhaps the most important, is that which describes the establishment of the Macedonian hegemony in Greece. This story is told very well indeed, and the causes of Philip's success are made patent enough; but at several points there is a little obscurity, or lack of clear connection, by reason of this very laxity in the matter of dates.

This book well illustrates the present chaotic usage as to the spelling and pronunciation of ancient proper names. Mr. Grote introduced to English readers the practice of abandoning the Roman orthography of Greek names, and presenting them directly in their original form. Mr. Freeman did the same thing for Anglo-Saxon names, but has had few followers. With Greek names, however, the new practice has grown, and has seemed to be

necessarily connected with the adoption of the true Greek pronunciation in place of the so-called English method. This does not follow, however. We have no question that Greek and Latin, as foreign tongues, should be pronounced as nearly as possible in the way the Greeks and Romans themselves pronounced them. But when we speak of men and cities in the English language we should use those forms which have, so to speak, become naturalized in the English language. We do not speak of Kikero and Kaisar, but of Cicero and Caesar. Now, it is not always easy to say when a name has become naturalized, and the book before us is bewildering in its inconsistencies. We have Athens and Thebes, but Boiotia and Phokis; Thessaly, Macedon, Thrace, and the Chersonese, but Thermopylai, Chalkidike, and Euboia. It is hard to say why Delphi and Chaeronea have not entered into English literature as much as Cyrus and Tyre. The maps are excellent, and the story of Alexander's campaigns is lucidly and vigorously told.

A Talmudical Miscellany; or, a Thousand and One Extracts from the Talmud. By P. I. Hershon. (London: Trübner & Co. 1880. Pp. xxvii.-361.)—Considered as an historical record the Talmud is of an incalculable value. Whoever can read it with discerning eye will find the Talmudic literature of the greatest aid to a correct and familiar understanding of Jewish life in all its diversified aspects during the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the rise of the Christian religion. But this literature is a very peculiar one, and in respect to its disorderliness and linguistic difficulties has hardly a parallel in the literature of any nation. There have been many attempts to bring order into this chaos, and to make its contents more or less accessible to a larger class of students; Mr. Hershon's is a total failure: he has only succeeded in making confusion worse confounded. We have in this 'Miscellany' a mere collection of disconnected quotations and extracts, arranged in the following singular way: The first chapter, headed "The Ones of the Talmud," contains a number of sentences and sayings in which the numeral one occurs; the second chapter, headed "The Twos of the Talmud," quotes sentences containing the numeral two, and in this order and manner the work proceeds. The last two chapters purport to consist of "Extracts from the Kabbalah," though the author reproduces nothing but a number of grotesque quotations from the *Kitzur Sh"lu!* (we retain his characteristic orthography). Now, if any one should publish a 'Shakspearean Miscellany' by selecting first a number of scattered lines from Shakspeare containing the adjective white, and then a number of lines containing the adjective green, and so forth; or should undertake to instruct the world adequately about the character and leading thoughts of the patristic literature by first stringing together fifty disconnected sentences in which accidentally the noun lion occurs, and then fifty other sentences alluding to the fox, and fifty others to the lamb, he would as well interpret Shakspeare or the Fathers of the Church as Mr. Hershon has interpreted the Talmud. The 'Miscellany' is, in short, a nearly valueless work, lacking in method and scholarship, and betraying in dozens of places gross ignorance (see, for instance, the author's remarks on Midrashim, on p. 282 *et seq.*, or on Kabbalah, on p. 318 *et seq.*) But we will not deny that the general reader may derive considerable amusement from it.

The Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown, in the County of Middlesex and Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 1629-1818. By Thomas Bellows Wyman. (Boston: David Clapp & Son. 1879. 2 vols.)—These volumes belong to that class of literary work which always excites wonder by the mere fact of its existence. The disproportion is so great between the patient labor necessary in preparing such a book and the reward either in money or reputation, that it is difficult to understand why a man is willing to submit to it. Yet work of this sort, when it is well done, has a very great value to the student and historian, to the genealogist, to families, and to lawyers. From Charlestown, as from most New England towns, there went forth many men and women to plant families and aid in the foundation of States, and win renown in all parts of the continent, while others clung to the old town where the Massachusetts Government first met, and which has now been absorbed by the capital, its younger and more prosperous neighbor. Mr. Wyman has gone with patient industry through all the dreary records of deeds and wills, of births, marriages, baptisms, and funerals, and has made a complete dictionary of Charlestown families and estates. He has not wasted his strength on extended notices of the men and families which achieved eminence, and which are assured of recognition elsewhere, but in a thoroughly conscientious and democratic spirit has dealt impartially and equally with all. No name was too obscure to elude his research, and nothing has escaped enumeration. The interest of the book is, of course, chiefly local, but many famous names come within its scope, and, owing to the migratory habits of the New England people, many persons scattered all over the country will find here a careful description of the stock from which they sprang.

Such work as this fails often to meet with even the slender meed of recognition which may be expected. There is, of course, nothing about it to

attract the notice of that vague entity the "general public"; it smacks of dusty archives and is antiquarian in every respect. Yet it is difficult to do well, and any one who is familiar with the intricacies and confusion of genealogies and estates will appreciate the high rank won by such work when it can be fairly said, as in the present instance, that it is thoroughly well done and deserves the most ample praise. The fate of the author gives to these dry records a pathetic interest. The collection of the material used in these two handsomely printed volumes was the work, pleasure, and interest of a lifetime. For thirty years Mr. Wyman labored among old deeds and wills, giving generously from his stores to others, like Mr. Savage and Mr. Frothingham, without a thought of self. At last his patient toil came to an end, his material was all ready, and he was about to reap the results of his quiet industry and gratify his simple ambition by publication. The first fifty pages had just passed through the press when Mr. Wyman died, after a brief illness, with the fruition of his thirty years' work unaccomplished. He entrusted his material to Mr. H. H. Edes, of Charlestown, who has edited the two volumes with a care, simplicity, and unassuming thoroughness which do him great credit; for the task was not easy, and was undertaken purely as a labor of love and in justice to Mr. Wyman's memory. The book ought to find a place in every American public library.

Schiller and his Times. By Johannes Scherr. In three books. Translated from the German by Elizabeth McClellan. With Illustrations. (Philadelphia: Ig. Kohler; New York: Christern.)—Miss McClellan has done exceedingly well a good service to literature. Her translation is close, and yet her style has little of the characteristic complexity of the original. Scherr's 'Schiller' is an admirable picture of the Germany of Schiller's time, and deserves introduction to the large circle of students of literary history who have not mastered the intricacies of the German language. Miss McClellan makes grateful acknowledgment of the assistance and encouragement of the Rev. Frank Colton, an accomplished scholar, whose death has occurred since the work was sent to press. The publisher shares the enthusiasm of the translator for Schiller, and reproduces some of the well-known woodcuts which have figured in the original German and in other books; many of them are curious and interesting, but others are hardly worthy of the otherwise attractive mechanical execution of this volume.

The Orthoepist: A Pronouncing Manual, containing about three thousand five hundred words. By Alfred Ayres. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.)—This is a very fair book of its kind. Its main defect is the attempt to refine too much, especially in the pronunciation of the vowels, and to make and enforce distinctions that do not really exist. Still, it is usually safe to follow the pronunciations of particular words as given in this book; it is not always so safe, however, to condemn those that are here condemned. Books of this sort, indeed, are useful so long as they are not appealed to as final authorities. While our present system of orthography exists, while most words can be pronounced, according to analogy, in half a dozen different ways, wide differences in usage must be expected to spring up and maintain themselves;

and it is idle to denounce the method of one man or one place because it fails to conform to the method followed by another man or another place. It will be noticed that those who have studied orthoepy most profoundly and scientifically are the least apt to be positive upon questions of usage. A curious illustration of the failure to comprehend the facts of the situation can be found in the remarks of the compiler upon *squalor*. "This," says he, referring to the marking *squā'lor*, "is the marking of all the dictionaries; but universal usage makes the word *squā'lor*." How does Mr. Ayres know the "universal usage" in regard to the pronunciation of this word? Has he personally interrogated on this point all the highly-educated men of the English-speaking race, who would naturally be looked upon as authorities in usage? All that his sentence means is that he individually has not happened to come into contact with any one who sounds the *a* in this word as long; and from the practice of the few score, or possibly the few hundreds, he may have heard employ it he infers the practice of the millions who speak English. A knowledge of general principles, however, is not essential, in a work of this kind, to correctness of details, and in details this work will be usually found trustworthy.

Essays of Joseph Addison. Chosen and edited by John Richard Green, M.A., LL.D. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1881.)—This elegant volume of an elegantly-printed series is filled with about seventy of Addison's essays. The selection has been made with great taste and judgment. There is variety enough to give to the reader a pretty accurate idea of the distinguishing characteristics of an author who has long occupied a foremost place in English literature, and who still continues to be highly praised though very moderately read. The editor prefixes an introduction, the merit of which is hardly on a level with the skill displayed in the selection. It not only gives expression to some generalizations more than doubtful, it is especially unfair in its treatment of Steele; and this injustice is carried still further in attributing to Addison the general account of the characters of the Spectator Club, which is perfectly well known to have been the work of his coadjutor. The concluding portion of the introduction contains, however, a fine and thoughtful analysis of Addison's merits and defects both as a thinker and as a writer.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Bagehot (W.), Biographical Studies.....	(Longmans, Green & Co.)
Bates (Miss C. F.), Longfellow Birthday Book.....	(Houghton, Mifflin & Co.)
Dixie (Lady Florence), Across Patagonia.....	(R. Worthington) \$1 75
Edis (Robert W.), Decoration and Furniture of Town-Houses.....	(Scribner & Welford) 3 50
Jackson (L. D'A.), Pocket Logarithms.....	(W. H. Allen & Co.)
Mahaffy (Prof. J. P.), Descartes.....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Mitchell (F. A.), The Past in the Present.....	(Harper & Brothers.)
Piatt (J. J.), Idyls and Lyrics of the Ohio Valley.....	(W. E. Diddle)
Stevens (A.), Madame de Staël, 2 vols.....	(Harper & Brothers.)
Tanner (H.), Martyrdom of Lovejoy.....	(Fergus Printing Co.)
Thoreau (H. D.), Early Spring in Massachusetts.....	(Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) 1 50
Verne (J.), The Demon of Cawnpore.....	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 1 50
Ward (T. H.), The English Poets, vols. iii., iv.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 1 70
Wells (J. C.), Magna Charta.....	(Mills & Co.)
Whittier (J. G.), The King's Missive.....	(Houghton, Mifflin & Co.)
Worman (Prof. J. H.), First German Book.....	(A. S. Barnes & Co.) 35

The Leaden Casket.

A Novel. By Mrs. A. W. Hunt. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

"The reviewer is generally thankful and grateful for signs of excellence in any one hand of novel-writing—for a well-conceived plot, for clever condensation, for lifelike characters. What must be his feelings, therefore, who excels in a high degree in each of these branches?"—*London Academy*.

The Human Body.

An Account of its Structure and Activities, and the Conditions of its Healthy Working. By H. Newell Martin, D.Sc., M.A., M.B., Professor of Biology in the Johns Hopkins University. Large 12mo (American Science Series), \$2 75.

Copies without the Appendix on Reproduction will be sent when specially ordered.

Fyffe's History of Modern Europe.

By C. A. Fyffe, M.A. Vol. I. From the Outbreak of the Revolutionary War in 1792 to the Ac-

cession of Louis XVIII. in 1814. Large 12mo, \$2 50.

Sister Augustine,

An Old Catholic, Superior of the Sisters of Charity at the St. Johannis Hospital, Bonn. 12mo, \$1 75.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

A General Index

TO

The Nation,

From JULY, 1865, to SEPTEMBER, 1880.

Net price (no trade discount), paper, \$2; cloth, \$2 50. Purchasers will please remit with order. Address Publisher of the *Nation*, Box 25, New York, or

Q. P. INDEX, Bangor, Maine.

Kissena Nurseries.

PARSONS & SONS CO.

(LIMITED),

FLUSHING, N. Y. (NEAR NEW YORK CITY).

Send three 3-cent stamps for large new Descriptive Catalogue.

The Duties of Women.

By FRANCES POWER COBBE.

Author's Edition. 12mo, cloth, \$1.

GEORGE H. ELLIS, Publisher,

141 Franklin Street, Boston.

UNMOUNTED PHOTOGRAPHS

Of ANCIENT and MODERN WORKS of ART, embracing reproductions of famous original paintings, sculpture, architectural subjects, etc. Price, cabinet size, \$1 50 per doz. Send stamp for catalogue of 1,600 subjects. JOHN P. SOULE, Publisher, 338 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

MACMILLAN & CO.'S

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Completion of Ward's 'English Poets.'

THE ENGLISH POETS.

Selections, with Critical Introductions by various writers, and a General Introduction by Matthew Arnold. Edited by Thomas Humphry Ward, M.A. Vol. III.—Addison to Blake. Vol. IV.—Wordsworth to Dobell. Library Edition, each \$1 75; Student's Edition, each \$1 25. Complete in four volumes, in box, Library Edition, \$7; Student's Edition, \$5.

Vol. I. Chaucer to Donne. Vol. II. Ben Jonson to Dryden. Vol. III. Addison to Blake. Vol. IV. Wordsworth to Sydney Dobell.

"A work of the very highest excellence."—*Academy*.

"The best book of its kind extant."—*Scotsman*.

"The book is one to find its place in every library."—*Boston Traveller*.

"They fill a gap in English letters, and they should find a place in every school library. . . . English poetry is epitomized, and that so brilliantly and well as to make of the book in which the feat is done one of the best publications of its epoch."—*Teacher*.

"For the young, no work they will meet with can give them so good a view of the large and rich inheritance that lies open to them in the poetry of their country."—*J. C. Shairp, in Academy*.

"These volumes are an earnest of the satisfactory execution of an almost ideal literary scheme."—*Nation*.

"The completion of the publication of the 'English Poets' in four volumes by Macmillan & Co. is a literary event worthy of special note. . . . These volumes contain the pure gold of English poetry, and their value is further greatly increased by short but very incisive and comprehensive criticisms of each poet represented in the volume, from the hand of some one notably in sympathy with his work. The books are a library in themselves, and those who are now learning English poetry at second-hand cannot do better than to substitute these volumes for the critical works to which they give so much time."—*Christian Union*.

THE STATESMAN'S YEAR-BOOK. Statistical and Historical Annual of the States of the Civilized World. For the Year 1881. Revised after Official Returns. By Frederick Martin. 12mo, \$3.

KAMILAROI AND KURNAI—Group —. Marriage and Relationship, and Marriage by Elopement. By Lorimer Fison, M.A., and A. W. Howitt, F.G.S. With an Introduction by Lewis H. Morgan, LL.D. 8vo, \$5.

THE ABBOTT'S FARM; or, Practice with Science. By Henry Tanner, M.R.A.C., F.C.S. 16mo, \$1 25.

DICKENS'S DICTIONARY OF DAYS: Being an Every-day Record of 1880. With Calendar and Useful Information for 1881. 12mo, limp, 75 cents.

LOUKIS LARAS; or, The Reminiscences of a Chiote Merchant during the Greek War of Independence. From the Greek of D. Bikélas. Translated, with Introduction on the Rise and Development of Modern Greek Literature, by J. Gennadius. 12mo, \$2 25.

DISTURBED IRELAND: Being the Letters written during the Winter of 1880-81, by Bernard H. Becker, Special Commissioner of the *Daily News*. 12mo, \$2.

THE STEAM-ENGINE AND ITS INVENTORS. A Historical Sketch. By Robert L. Galloway. 12mo, \$3 50.

LECTURES ON TEACHING. Delivered in the University of Cambridge during the Lent Term, 1880. By J. G. Fitch, M.A., one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. 12mo, \$1 75. (Cambridge University Press.)

A SHORT MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF INDIA. With an Account of India as it is: the Soil, Climate, and Productions; the People, their Races, Religions, etc., etc. By Roper Lethbridge, M.A.C.L.E. With Maps. 12mo, \$1 50.

Macmillan's Classical Series.

OVID. *Fasti.* Edited, with Notes and Introductions, by G. H. Hallam, M.A. 16mo, \$1 25.

PLAUTUS. *Miles Gloriosus.* A Revised Text, with Notes, by R. Y. Tyrrell, M.A. 16mo, \$1 25.

Macmillan's Elementary Classics.

CÆSAR. *Leaves from the Fifth and Sixth Books of the 'Gallic War.'* Edited, with Notes, by G. Colbeck, M.A. 18mo, 40 cents.

LIVY. *The Hannibalian War.* Being Part of the Twenty-first and Twenty-second Books of Livy. By G. C. Macaulay, M.A. 18mo, 40 cents.

MACMILLAN & CO., 22 Bond Street, New York.

ex
"th
sp
pe
su
at
fo
o
ch
as
th
H
p
S
th
n
n
t
n
n
v
o
p
M
h
o
C
n
P

a
n
o
P
t
o
b
w
t
s
t
de
int
no
cr
M
su
re
di
ca
lu
th
of
th
re
op
af
So